Class 2265 Book C88

General Theological Seminary Library

CHELSEA SQUARE, NEW YORK

BENJAMIN I. HAIGHT LIBRARY FUND

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/bwb_C0-ASP-758

THE SYNOPTIC PROBLEM AND A NEW SOLUTION

THE SYNOPTIC PROBLEM AND A NEW SOLUTION

BY

R. H. CROMPTON

AUTHOR OF "THE FUTURE OF CHRISTIANITY"

Edinburgh: T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street

1928

2265
C88
121073

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
MORRISON AND GIBB LIMITED

FOR

T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH

LONDON : SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, HAMILTON, KENT, AND CO. LIMITED
NEW YORK : CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS

PREFACE

Some ten years ago, in glancing through one of the old harmonies where the incidents of the four Gospels were numbered and placed side by side in what was intended for chronological order, I was struck with the sequence of numbers which groups of similar incidents possessed. Was it coincidence, or did it point to some intention ?

What methods were employed to find an answer is of no importance now, but it became increasingly evident, to me at any rate, that the source of our Gospels was emerging. How far it is here reproduced and will meet criticism remains to be seen ; but, if in any sense my claim is made good, we have what is virtually a new document with an authority so great as to be the standard of judgment for all others. It demands a transmutation of values so that the inquiry widens till it embraces the whole of the New Testament. It needs expert knowledge from many sources all directed and co-ordinated to a common end.

Some time ago an interested friend, himself no mean expert in New Testament research, suggested that the facts coming to light should be brought

before a body of students for discussion. The subject has however grown since then, and become too wide even if there were those who had the available leisure to take part in such a co-operative inquiry. I have therefore attempted the task myself of outlining the new method and to a limited extent applying it.

The immediate result is to make the source of the Synoptic Gospels a reality, and enable its contents to be discerned with sufficient certitude to give it practical value. I make no claim that what is here called the Pre-Synoptic Gospel is presented in all its perfection and completeness. That can never be reached with our present knowledge, but as already suggested it can be approximated by the co-operation of students and the co-ordination of knowledge. My object is to demonstrate that perfection and completeness did exist, that there is no need to be a mental acrobat to overcome the obstacles which the unnatural narrative of the Gospels places in the path of religious progress, that in its original form Christianity was a conception of God and man's relationship to Him which has been lost and forgotten, and that no man has yet regained the sublime and eternally true conception which was the inspiration of the earliest founders of our faith.

This volume is concerned with the immediate result, but there are many inevitable consequences affecting our appreciation of the whole of the New

Testament. Paul is no longer the earliest witness we possess. He can now be cross-examined in the light of more certain knowledge. There are other witnesses who have in the past been discredited because they differed from Paul. All can now be compared with an independent standard; so can the letters of one individual and his mental growth stand revealed. Harmony did not always exist among the early leaders of the Church; but when we have a near approximation to the original teaching we can form an opinion as to their relative worth, and even estimate the order in which their works were written.

These early leaders died, and the thoughts of a second generation who knew not Jesus were given to the world; but it is still possible to place the writings in the balance, to weigh them against the earliest apostolic teaching, and to follow the conflicting thread of theology and controversy. This and much more needs to be done, for students are confronted by many problems other than the Synoptic one which only require the right approach and key for their solution, and the key of one may open the approach to another.

R. H. C.

CONTENTS

CHAP.		PAGE
	PREFACE—THE PRE-SYNOPTIC GOSPEL	v
I.	THE NEW METHOD OUTLINED	1
II.	TABLES A. AND B.	13
III.	TABLE D.: THE FIRST TO THE EIGHTH N.P.	26
IV.	TABLE C.	39
V.	TABLE D.: NINTH TO TWENTY-SECOND N.P.	47
VI.	THE GOSPEL FOR CATECHETICAL INSTRUCTION	55
VII.	THE FOUNDER OF CHRISTIANITY	66
VIII.	THE SYMBOLICAL PORTION	74
IX.	THE DIDACTIC PORTION	103
X.	THE NEW POINT OF VIEW	130
	APPENDIX A. TABLE A.	*At end*
	APPENDIX B. TABLE B.	
	APPENDIX C. TABLE C.	
	APPENDIX D. TABLE D. NARRATIVE PARALLELS OF THE GOSPEL OF LUKE	
	APPENDIX E. INDEX OF SERIES AND STAGE: THE GOSPEL OF LUKE RE-ARRANGED IN PRE-SYNOPTIC ORDER	

THE SYNOPTIC PROBLEM AND A NEW SOLUTION

CHAPTER I

THE NEW METHOD OUTLINED

One of the most baffling questions that have faced students of the Bible is: Why should there exist such likenesses and differences in the first three Gospels? It has become so elusive as to earn the title of "The Synoptic Problem." In its earliest phase the problem made itself known through the likenesses in the Gospels. Similarity was responsible for the obvious conclusion that they must have had a common source, and many combinations of sources were tried in the endeavour to hit upon a fitting solution, but with little satisfaction. One after another these theories withered. They died through inability to absorb the additional facts that they brought to light, and the pathway became strewn with defunct and rejected solutions. The difficulty was to find a secure basis for work.

Things had reached such a pass when interest was revived by the simple fact, brought out by Rushbrook in his *Synopticon*, that, where all three documents

are parallel, Matthew and Luke contain no language in common that is not also found in Mark. If we write down the language common to the three Gospels, we have a perfectly understandable narrative, which has been called the Triple Tradition; and, if we take only the words common to Matthew and Luke, they, too, are practically a copy of this same suggestive outline. From this fact Rushbrooke drew the conclusion, by reasoning almost mathematical in character, that Mark was one of the sources, at any rate, of the other two Gospels. His conclusion was accepted as absolutely proved, and, to make good Mark's deficiency, an elastic but unknown and hypothetical document, Q, based on the common matter of Matthew and Luke not given by Mark, was coupled with it as the second source!

It was in this manner that the Two-Document Hypothesis which for some time has been the generally accepted theory came into being, and as a basis for examination has served a useful if somewhat negative purpose. Progress, however, seems again at a standstill, and signs are not wanting that even this theory will follow the others and become one more derelict by the wayside. The theory of the priority of Mark fails to solve many details, and serious questions of divergence are left unexplained. The consequence is that the original theory has to be hedged round with reservations and conditions of various sorts to assist in its support.

Some of these reservations are perfectly reason-

able. We are dealing with copies of documents centuries older, which have been exposed to many vicissitudes. Even in the compilation of each Gospel there must have been many causes for divergence, *e.g.*, the human factor, with its fallibilities, which readily accounts for many of them. It is not to be expected that two men will use the same source in identically the same way. One man will be more accurate than another, and, when something more than mere clerks or copyists, each will display individuality of treatment.

But the tendency is to forget the great fact upon which the whole theory rests, and to depose Mark from that premier place which is his by right of an almost mathematical proof. Hawkins, in his essay in *Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem* (p. 29 ff.), has concluded that Luke did not use Mark in the large sections Luke vi. 20–viii. 3, and ix. 51–xviii. Streeter, in a recent article (*Hibbert Journal*, October 1921), adds many other sections, and concludes that Luke's premier source was a proto-Luke, into which he fitted material derived from Mark, and from other sources, while Bartlet, in his commentary on Mark in the *Century Bible*, has a complex and very detailed theory which quite relegates Mark to second place.

Latest of all there is Dr. Streeter's book, *The Four Gospels*, which deals almost exclusively with this problem, and which is an expansion of his earlier article. The Two-Document theory has now to be

hedged round with innumerable restrictions and conditions. None of them is impossible in itself when the premises are granted; but, taken as a whole, which must be done, they each add their modicum of improbability with a corresponding reduction in probability.

It is unnecessary to raise points of criticism here. Many will have to be met from time to time as they present themselves; but the cul-de-sac of the theory has been reached, and a way can only be made along a tortuous path supported by crumbling buttresses. Dr. Streeter has only just touched the fringe of the problem of Christian origins in his 600 pages, yet he requires five other sources before he can explain the existence of Matthew and Luke. For Matthew we have an Antiochene tradition and a Jerusalem source: for Luke he requires a proto-Luke, built up of Q and Luke's Cæsarean notes, as well as an independent origin for chapters i. and ii. Of course, with a sufficient number of reservations and conditions, it is possible to explain almost anything except the absolute contradiction; but, with each added source, the probability of the theory, as a whole, is decreased in an almost geometrical progression, and, for all practical purposes, the added five make the probability of truth zero.

But supposing this complicated theory of sources is a revelation of the actual truth, what good does it do? or what practical purpose is served? We are not a whit nearer the understanding of Christian

origins. In fact, it accentuates the great paradox which runs athwart the whole body of the Christian Church, no matter of what denomination. In practice and belief the Church is founded upon Christ, the Divine Son of God. In theory of its origins it assumes that the simplicity of humanity and the primitive environment are the criteria.

To harmonize these two conflicting aspects, the divine and the human, there is a growing tendency in gospel study to devise apologies and explanations for those features which partake of the superhuman. The supernatural happenings which, years ago, were supreme evidence of its divine character are now obstacles in the way of faith, and they are removed by the simple expedient of bringing the supernatural into the realm of the natural. Miracles, no longer the evidence of the might of God, are coincidence, or the reaction of the extraordinary personality of Jesus upon an imaginative race. When the storm on the lake ceased, it was not because Jesus rebuked it, but because the winds rise and fall with remarkable suddenness on Gennesareth, and the disciples woke Jesus just before it happened to stop blowing. Faith-healing and suggestion were important factors, while the Resurrection became a fact of history because some of the disciples, in a state of nervous tension, thought they saw Jesus after His crucifixion.

It is a pity that those who are so ready with their apologies and explanations of the supernatural

record do not set to work to write their own version of the gospel. They would find that, instead of giving life to its great army of religious truths, they had produced a valley full of dry bones. These unwarrantable assumptions may make a temporary appeal, and, for a time, still questions of the truth of the Gospels; but it will be a superficial peace —a calm like that found in the centre of a cyclone.

But why make such strenuous endeavours to twist the path of truth into that of desire? A moment's unprejudiced consideration should suffice to show that truth is the most desirable thing, and, often, far removed from desire. It is, in fact, the avenue from which all others branch. If we think to find God anywhere else we deceive ourselves. In this avenue we are always meeting new things whose unfamiliarity strikes a note of fear. But, when we listen intently and with courage, from the hidden depths of our being there comes a response, the recognition of a friend, and a longing for more of this music of the unknown.

The difficulty of reaching a solution of these problems of the gospel has been that there are so few facts upon which to base any definite conclusions, and that the most is not made of what there are. Unique features are displayed by the Gospels, but they are not submitted to any severe critical examination. They are simply accepted as evidence of the unique character of the personality with which they

deal. This is not a logical deduction. It begs the question. It closes the gates to critical study, and, when the crying need is to learn more of Jesus, it is faithless folly to shut any possible avenue of knowledge even though it does not conform to what we desire or expect.

It is not the purpose here to catalogue the difficulties surrounding the Synoptic Gospels, but rather to break fresh ground, and to apply new methods. We must disregard all existing theories or assumptions, even those sanctioned by the canons of historical criticism. The Gospels must speak for themselves. They are the only source of knowledge we possess. Unfortunately, they are documents removed by more than one generation from the facts with which they deal. They are also dependent upon some lost original. This is an obvious deduction from their similarity in structure and identity in language in many passages, which is admitted in all responsible quarters.

It has not been fully recognized, however, that this characteristic of the Synoptics has a deeper significance, and extends from a direct parallelism of the same events in place and time to a more subtle one of sequences of events, not the same, but similar. This statement applies with equal force to the sayings and didactic passages of what has been called Q. There is, in fact, no difference in this respect between these two kinds of passages. It is a feature which all the Gospels display, but is to be best observed in Luke.

These facts will emerge more clearly when Table A. comes to be studied in detail; but if there is parallelism of idea between sequences of sayings which are not parallel in language or chronological, it is a legitimate inference that there must be some purpose and intention behind it. And, when events display a similar feature of parallelism to that of the sayings, the probability is that behind them, too, there is a similar intention, and the questions at once arise: How can such an artificial order of events be history? Is this an isolated phenomenon or does it persist? Does it apply to a few passages here and there which can be accounted for by coincidence, or is it of the nature of the Gospel? If it is the latter, and the intention of the parallelism of idea can be brought to light, it is very evident that a long step has been taken to the solution of the Synoptic Problem.

By the extent of the passages with which they deal, Tables B. and C. exclude coincidence, and do something to reveal what this intention is. Considerable portions of the Gospels are there divided up into passages which are either single events or sayings dealing with only one subject. The principle of arrangement is that events and sayings should be noted one under the other in the order in which the narrative gives them, and so continued down one column, till what may be called the didactic ideas are observed to repeat, when the second column is started, and so on till the end of the passage under consideration.

Now it is clear, when a sufficient length of the narrative is used so as to eliminate all chance of coincidence, that, if there is a didactic intention underlying the Gospels, it will reveal itself by its frequent repetition in the various columns. At the same time it ought to display the ideas in their original sequence of thought. And, if there is a logical argument, we ought to be able to observe its beginning and complete outline.

Tables A., B., and C., however, only deal with portions of the Gospels, and certain discrepancies emerge which indicate that, although the didactic sequence does exist and has a logical argument, it is not made use of by all the Gospels in exactly the same manner, or with equal fidelity. It is therefore necessary to apply the principle to one Gospel only, and, for that purpose, the whole of the Gospel of Luke is analyzed in Table D.

From this Table the facts emerge that what have been called, according to the Two-Document theory, Mark and Q are in reality two complementary portions of the one Gospel. They are here termed the Symbolical and Didactic Portions. They are composed of a sevenfold repetition of two distinct lines of argument, each of which is a logical sequence. In addition, there is a small residuum composed of the pre-Baptism narrative, and a few other passages which have definite characteristics of their own, but which find no place in the Argument, and, in fact, often conflict and interfere with it.

If a sevenfold parallelism of teaching can be produced from the various passages and sayings of Luke's Gospel in the manner indicated above, it will readily be seen that every item of the Gospel will find a new context. They are no longer an indiscriminate mixture of events and sayings, frequently with different contexts and historical settings in the three Synoptics. Each one is an item in a series of six others of similar didactic intention. Furthermore, they follow others which belong to earlier steps in the common argument, and themselves throw light upon the seven of the series immediately following. They will thus offer means of severely testing the accuracy of the analysis, and the deductions reached from the various Tables, by an inquiry into the meaning of passages in their new contexts.

An exegetical outline has been attempted in Chapters VIII. and IX. Space forbids detailed examination, but sufficient has been done to reveal the fact that the sevenfold parallelism of teaching is a progressive unfolding of the Argument, that the teaching is latent in the earlier members, and that all have to be read in the light of the final or seventh stage of the series. It offers conclusive proof that we have reached a close approximation to the source upon which Luke relied. And, owing to the fact that this result can be reached only from Luke, it is almost an inevitable conclusion that the source of all the Gospels is embedded in his Gospel.

This sevenfold parallelism of Luke is set out in tabular form in Appendix E. And, for the purpose of definition, it can be called the Pre-Synoptic Gospel. It must be clearly borne in mind, however, that what we really possess is Luke re-arranged more or less in pre-synoptic order. Analysis and examination may clear away some of the accretions which time has introduced, and this explains the omission from the Table of some passages; but others remain, *e.g.* phrases and verses necessary to provide the continuity of narrative, and to string together the events and sayings in one context, must be different in another. And, as the Pre-Synoptic Gospel has a different sequence of narrative from that adopted by the redactor of Luke, what we have must certainly be the handiwork of the redactor, and not part of the Pre-Synoptic Gospel. We must also be in doubt as to how far he re-edited the stories, and to what extent his "history" is history.

Moreover it seems much more than probable that our Gospel of Luke is not even the original Luke. The suggestion of Table D. is that in the first edition of Luke the Pre-Synoptic Gospel was re-arranged in a new context, with the necessary connecting links. But the order in our Luke is interfered with, and broken just sufficiently to show that it is not perfectly done, and to suggest that it is not quite original. Material foreign to the Argument is added here and there. It seems necessary, then, to assume, even from Table D., that a proto-Luke

intervened between the Pre-Synoptic Gospel and Luke.

Notwithstanding this, and many other important questions that will arise, the solid fact remains that we have a close approximation to the source which underlies the Gospels, the date of which may be years earlier than any other New Testament document. It offers a new platform from which to regard the New Testament writings, and an earlier presentation of Christian teaching.

CHAPTER II

TABLES A. AND B.

After this outline of the object of the various Tables and their purpose as a whole, we can now examine in detail the passages which have enabled these conclusions to be drawn.

In Table A. the text of Matt. xvii. 14 – xx. 30, Mark ix. 14 – x. 47, Luke ix. 37 – xi. 14, and Luke xvii. 5 – xviii. 38 is set out in abbreviated form in four parallel columns, and divided for convenience of reference into thirteen separate items. It will be noted that in columns 1 and 2, occupied by Matthew and Mark, the subject-matter is much the same in substance, in the order in which it is written, and frequently in language. Luke also has a parallel version, but it does not correspond in order with the other two. Items 1–4 of columns 1 and 2 find their parallels in column 3, but items 7 – 13 correspond with column 4.

From the point of view of historical criticism there is evidently something wrong with the chronology, and the simplest explanation is that a portion of Luke's MS. has at one time become misplaced. There are, however, many other facts revealed by the Table which make this simple and apparently obvious

explanation quite insufficient. At the same time we have a reason for Luke's divergence without appealing to chance.

When we examine the passages of each item—that is, of all four columns—we find that there is a great family likeness between them, even when they are not chronologically one event. In item 1 there are three versions of the healing of the man's son from the Gentile city of Cæsarea Philippi, and one of the healing of the Samaritan leper. Neither of the healed, as far as we can tell, are Jews. "Thy faith hath made thee whole," said Jesus to the Samaritan. "I believe; help Thou mine unbelief," said the Cæsarean. Both show great faith, which is contrasted with that of the nine lepers and of the disciples. The nine lepers are represented as not giving glory to God; they clearly stand for the Jews, and, when the disciples are called a "faithless and perverse generation," they too in this instance admit of the same interpretation, even if they do not exactly demand it. The lepers say: "Master, have mercy upon us"; it is said of the Samaritan leper that "he fell down upon his face at His feet"; the boy's father came kneeling before Him, saying, "Lord, have mercy upon my son."

The importance of this similarity is enhanced by the dissimilarity which we find existing between the chronological parallels. Matthew says that the boy was epileptic; Mark that he had a dumb spirit; Luke that he had an unclean spirit. The leper

too was unclean, and when leprosy was at that time considered to be a possession of the Evil One, there is little difference between the four columns as far as the miracle is concerned.

There is, however, another misplacement, for the illustration of the Mustard Seed appears in columns 1 and 4. This time it is only a fragment which has gone astray, and, unless it is a copyist's slip of late date, it is an error on Luke's part. Writing from memory, he has incorporated this illustration here because the two miracles are so much alike. This explanation may have a semblance of truth; but, if Luke is secondary, his historical setting is wrong, unless, of course, the illustration was given by Jesus on both occasions. In view, however, of the artificiality of the narrative, which will reveal itself more and more as we proceed, this simple explanation must be ruled out. An illustration of artifice is to be found in item 3. We can note that Mark either takes the beginning of Matthew's Tribute-Money story for the setting of his item 4, or Matthew's Tribute-Money story has been inserted after the setting to item 4. Explanations are to be found in deliberate intention rather than in accident or carelessness.

It is hardly necessary to follow in detail the whole of the Table, which really speaks for itself. Such parallelism as that of Luke ix. 44, and xvii. 25 of item 2 is obvious; so also are those of the stories in items 8 and 13, and in a lesser degree

that of item 7; the babes are blessed by Jesus (column 4); "these things" are revealed to the babes, and blessed are the eyes that see (column 3).

There is, however, a further development of the parallelism which is very suggestive. If the cross-references of the Table are followed, it will be seen that there is parallelism between the components of different items. If we take Mark of item 7, the portions marked *a*, *b*, and *c* are practically reproduced by *a*, *b*, and *c* of item 4, while, with regard to *d*, although the circumstance leading to the rebuke of the disciples is not the same, and in item 7 rebuke is implied rather than spoken, there is a similarity of idea.

But item 12 is also parallel with number 4. Passages marked *e*, *f*, and *g* of Mark (item 12), find their parallel in *e*, *f*, and *g* of items 4 and 7. Parallelism can also be observed between items 2 and 10, and it is not confined to language, for in item 5 we have the story of the importunate man, with its application introduced by a passage on prayer which is identical in idea with item 11.

Table A. will repay detailed scrutiny, but already suggestions for fresh lines of study are observable. Columns 3 and 4, comprising a large section of Luke's narrative, display features of parallelism which suggest that there are standards for the establishment of the order of the narrative other than chronology. Comparing column 3 with 1 and 2, we find that for the first four items there is a chronological parallel

but for the last seven it is one of idea. Neither of the parallels is perfect, *e.g.* item 3 is missing from column 3 of the chronological parallel, and items 10 and 12 from the idea parallel; but the correspondence is about the same in each case, and sufficient to demonstrate the fact of parallelism without fear of contradiction.

The parallelism is more than that between sequences of historical events. It is to be observed in the arrangement of discourses which can have had no dependence for their order upon history. Item 5 gives us a story of an importunate woman, introduced by a saying on prayer and followed by its application, which turns into an anti-Jewish discourse. Item 11 is composed of similar ideas identical in sequence. Such parallelism of idea with a vivid imagination could be explained by coincidence: that both had an historical basis in some one discourse; but when the items are followed by the close parallels of 7 and 12, coincidence is out of the question, and the parallelism of idea assumes considerable importance because it shows its independence of chronology, and is to be found in whole sequences of items.

We have been dealing with a small portion of the Gospels; but we shall find that this repetition of argument is on such an extended scale when the rest of the narrative is examined as to admit of only one explanation, namely, that there was a purpose and intention in it, and that the redactor attached

a didactic value to the events with which he was dealing. And as an explanation of the contradictory chronology to be found in the Synoptics, we can assume as a working hypothesis that events have a didactic value which is differently assessed by Luke from Matthew and Mark. This assessment of didactic values is, however, more clearly shown by a reference to Table B., the purpose of which is to follow up the suggestion of Table A. that underlying the narrative, there is a sequence of thought which repeats itself.

We can now confine attention to two larger passages: Matt. iii. 13–xv. 31 and Mark i. 9–vii. 37. They are very similar, but have important differences both in order and extent. The redactors have made different use of the narrative, and presumably have conflicting ideas of the didactic values of the items of which the narrative is composed.

To observe the extent of the difference it is necessary to follow through the order of each narrative and place the items side by side. In the first column of Table B. the items from Matt. iii. 13 to viii. 17 follow one another; but it will be observed that with viii. 18–22 the didactic idea begins to repeat itself. As a whole, the passage resolves itself into what might be called four Narrative Parallels, where the items A., B., C., etc., afford evidence of the parallelism of idea. The same plan has been adopted with Mark's passage, but to preserve the same sequence of idea as Matthew we find that we

only require three columns or Narrative Parallels instead of four.

Notwithstanding the different order of events as given by the two Gospels, the sequence of idea is the same. In other words, events falling by their order into the same item, or series, to use a more applicable term, have a similar quality of teaching or idea to be expressed. These series are lettered A. to H., and we can assume that each of these letters represents a didactic idea or quality of teaching; then all the incidents which fall on the horizontal lines of series A. have a common idea (*a*); all those which the order of the narrative requires that they should be placed in the next series will have a (*b*) value, and so on.

To avoid complicating the analysis we must, for the moment, disregard the Temptation and the discourses. They have their own significance. Series A. of the Table, with the common idea (*a*), can be expressed by the question: Who is Jesus? And there are three incidents, of which Mark only gives two. The idea (*b*), in the next series, is the announcement of the New Gospel, and the purpose of Jesus to preach it. "To them which sat in the region and shadow of death did light spring up" (Matt. iv. 16); "The time is fulfilled: repent ye, and believe the gospel" (Mark i. 15); "Tell John the things which ye do hear," etc. (Matt. xi. 4). There is also the feeding of the five thousand. Of course if this last incident is no more than a miraculous

satisfying of physical hunger, it affords little evidence of parallelism; but there is a deeper meaning than that. It teaches about the Bread of Life, and is a definite part of the preaching of the kingdom of God. Compare Luke's parallel ix. 11, "He spake to them of the kingdom of God," and Mark viii. 14 ff., which suggests that Jesus supplies a different bread from that of the Pharisees.

The (*c*) idea can be summed up in the word discipleship, and the command to follow. In Matthew we have, in the first column, the call of the four disciples, and, in the second, the conversation with the scribe and another about following. Instead of this second incident, we have, in Mark, the coming of Jesus' mother and brethren. In a superficial reading these two appear to be quite unrelated; but they bear close examination. Comparing Matt. viii. 18–22 with the more extended parallel of Luke ix. 57–62, we find that the teaching is summed up in the words: "No man, having put his hand to the plough, and looking back, is fit for the kingdom of God." It is a saying which comes very appropriately after the (*b*) idea, and is the negative form of Mark iii. 35. The different sayings of Matthew and Mark are then parallel in thought, and both teach the (*c*) idea; but the Synoptists have a different opinion about the correct order.

In the next series, or (*d*) values, we have six miracles and three general statements of healing showing the power of Jesus over demons. It is

true that one of those passages, Matt. viii. 14–17, is out of order. This, however, is a mistake in Matthew's Gospel only. As to the similarity of idea in all these incidents, there can hardly be much question. If we compare the healing of the demoniac, Mark i. 21–28 = Luke iv. 31–37, with the story of the Stilling of the Tempest, Matt. viii. 23–27 = Mark iv. 35–41 = Luke viii. 22–25, we see a great deal that is parallel between them. Of the unclean spirit we read that it tore the man and threw him down in the midst. Jesus said: "Hold thy peace and come out of him." Then, when the brain-storm has passed, all is calm, and the multitude is astonished, saying: "What is this word? for with authority and power He commandeth the unclean spirits and they come out." Of the storm on the lake we read that, tossed with the waves, and buffeted by the wind, the disciples cry out: "Save, Lord; we perish." And as He rebuked the devil so Jesus rebukes the storm, saying: "Peace, be still," and the men marvelled, saying: "What manner of man is this that even the winds and the sea obey Him?" Substitute devil for storm, and there is, in the one story, the counterpart of the other. We can also compare the healing of the Gerasene, which in all the Synoptics comes after the story of the Tempest, with the casting out of the same devil. Mark and Luke, in their narratives of the Gerasene's miracle, have as much accord with Mark and Luke of the earlier miracle as with their own chronological parallel in

Matthew; compare Mark i. 24, 25, 28 with Mark v. 7, 8, and 20.

There is also little essential difference between the Stilling of the Tempest and the Walking on the Storm. And it is significant that the link employed before each of them in Mark should make use of the phrase, "when even was come."

In Matthew the Sermon on the Mount, chapters v. to vii., now intervenes; but, following it, we have the healing of the leper and the Centurion's servant who was sick of the palsy. This is parallel with Mark's version of the healing of the leper and the sick of the palsy. The Centurion's servant is credited with palsy in Matthew only, to give the same sequence of idea as Mark, while Matthew's parallel of Mark's sick of the palsy appears in the next column. The incident deals with the disbelief of the Pharisees, or official Judaism, and, tentatively at any rate, we may call this the (*e*) idea.

There is a similar illustration in the next series F., the prominent feature of which is feasting and eating. Matthew places the feast at *the house* parallel with the "feast in the cornfields"; Mark gives them consecutively; but the fact that the idea of feasting is so prominent in the series certainly suggests that there is behind it some special significance. The healing of the man with the withered hand also belongs to this series. If we compare the incident with Luke xiv. 1–6, which is in many respects the other member of a doublet, we see that

the setting is the house of one of the rulers of the Pharisees where Jesus was eating on the Sabbath day. The material framework of eating is persistent. The stories tell us how differently the New Religion is received by those who are not "Pharisees."

The next series is suggestive of the healing of the Gentiles, the didactic idea of which may be indicated by the letter (*g*). The Centurion and the Syrophœnician woman were clearly Gentiles. We are not told that the woman with the issue of blood was a Jewess, and we are not bound to conclude that she was. It is clear, at any rate, that she was not of the Pharisaic order, while on the same line falls the saying: "In His name shall the Gentiles hope." There is, then, considerable justification for the conclusion that the didactic idea is the healing and faith of the Gentiles, although Matt. xv. 24—it is not found in Mark's parallel—implies a contradiction that Jesus had any mission to the Gentiles. We are, however, not now concerned with problems of exegesis; but, rather, with the similarity of idea, and, for that purpose, the negative is as good as the positive. The parallelism of language, quite apart from anything else, is abundantly clear. The teaching is about faith, and, in Matthew, each account ends with the statement that they were healed in that hour. These words do not appear outside this series.

The study of the remaining lines of the Table is

for the moment somewhat complicated by features not at present dealt with; but no comment is needed to show the parallelism behind the various miracles of healing the blind, the deaf, and the dumb, or the passages in which the Twelve figure as the important characters. We can note, also, that the raising of Jairus' daughter and Peter's mother-in-law fall into the same line in Matthew only—Mark and Luke both give the latter a (*d*) value—and, for that reason, apparently, Matt. viii. 15 approximates to Matt. ix. 25 the (*h*) idea. Luke iv. 39: "He rebuked the fever," iv. 35, and viii. 24, express the (*d*) idea.

The above preliminary examination will have to be amplified later when applied to the Gospel of Luke; but it already brings out the fact that nearly the first half of Mark's narrative is a threefold repetition, with occasional gaps in a sequence of argument. In Matthew this triple parallel is turned, by the addition of a few more incidents and the rearrangement of others, into a fourfold parallel in which the same sequence of idea, or argument, is preserved; and it is a legitimate conclusion that, behind such a coincidence, there must be a definite purpose. It points to a source with a sequence of argument embodying the (*a*–*h*) idea, which is very different from those (Mark and Q) usually assumed to have existed. The redactor did not abstract here a bit from one source and here a bit from another in a more or less capricious manner. There must

have been some plan or principle which exerted a guiding influence upon the selection of passages in the narrative.

The argument or sequence of teaching which the narrative order gives, although following progressively the (*a*) to (*h*) sequence, is not consecutive. In all the Narrative Parallels there are gaps. In the three parallels of Mark there are seven. They are, of course, considerably increased in Matthew owing to the fact that, with only three additional incidents, he opens out the story into four parallels by the re-arrangement of the incidents. Now, when Matthew has in this way so increased the number of gaps, we are justified in thinking that the original, or Source, may be in the (*a*) to (*h*) sequence without gaps. And if, aided by the information already gleaned, we can extend the parallelism so as to absorb all the incidents of the Gospels, we have a warrant for belief that the result will be a very close approximation to that Source.

CHAPTER III

TABLE D.: THE FIRST TO THE EIGHTH N.P.

So far we have been chiefly engaged with Matthew and Mark, and, when all preconceived notions of origin, or of what the Gospels ought to be, are put out of the mind, they make many suggestions. Besides any historical purpose which they may or may not have, they certainly have a didactic purpose, and display an ordered arrangement or sequence of incident which is not to be associated with history. We find that this sequence is repeated four times in so much of Matthew's Gospel as we examined, and that the four repetitions, which we have called Narrative Parallels — designated shortly as N.Ps. — are related one to another through a series of ideas which we indicated by the letters A.–H. In other words, these N.Ps. are somewhat broken reproductions of A.–H. The argument of the first N.P. is A, B, C, D, D, G; of the second, C, D, D, D, D, E, F, G, H; of the third, A, B, F, F, G; of the fourth, A, B, D, D, F, G.

The significance of this A.–H. order of idea is that it forms a logical argument which can be briefly outlined or summarized as follows:

(1) A.—Who is Jesus ?
(2) B.—The message of Jesus.
(3) C.—He calls men to follow.
(4) D.—He shows His power over evil.
(5) E.—He rebukes the Pharisees for their disbelief.
(6) F.—He praises others for their belief.
(7) G.—He heals those who have faith in Him.
(8) H.—He raises from the dead.

The only possible conclusion is that this A.–H. sequence of idea is prior to the N.Ps. of Matthew, and is the source from which these N.Ps., which are, without exception, in the same progressive order, have been derived. It must also be the source of a more extensive portion of the Gospel than the four N.Ps. of Matthew, for there are other incidents recorded which could be added to the list, *e.g.* the healing of the Samaritan leper has much in common with others of series G, and the healing of the son of the man from the multitude is parallel with it in Table A. The raising of the widow's son at Nain contains the idea of series H. And, if parallelism of language and idea are marks of a series of didactic values, Table A. suggests a parallelism lying beyond the A.–H. sequence, so that the source is A.–H. plus *x*.

At once there springs to the mind the opening sentence of Luke: "It seemed good to me also, having traced the course of all things accurately

from the first, to write to thee in order, most excellent Theophilus ; that thou mightest know the certainty concerning the things wherein thou wast instructed." What does he mean by writing in order ? It cannot be historical sequence, because the things that were put in order were the religious things wherein Theophilus was instructed. It is true that Luke professes to be very particular about some dates and details of secular history, but such statements as ii. 1, 2 and iii. 1, 2, do not belong to the story of Jesus' ministry. And it would be absurd to think that the things wherein Theophilus was in doubt were so paltry as the place of the Tempest after, rather than before, the healing of the paralytic. A much more reasonable conclusion is that the mysterious order of idea A.–H. plus x, which we find underlying the Gospel narrative, has something to do with it. It is, at any rate for the present, quite irrelevant to ask why the A.–H. order was not followed consecutively by the Synoptics. The point is : What did Luke do ?

If Luke has an ordered argument, and carried out his declared purpose, it is reasonable to think that it would be evidenced in the whole of his Gospel, and that, as far as the A.–H. idea is concerned, if the narrative be written down in tabular form after the manner of Table D., its return upon itself will indicate the N.Ps. Such a Table, however, must be made with considerable care and in some detail. We must allow for the possible additions of didactic

ideas to the argument. We can, therefore, drop the alphabetical arrangement for a numerical one, because a re-arrangement and extension of what we have called the pre-synoptic order A.–H. may quite upset the sequence of these letters which can now apply to Table B. only.

In our examination of Table B. we found that there were many incidents of a similar didactic value. Matthew had three A.'s, three B.'s, seven D.'s, and so on. It will therefore be necessary to differentiate between didactic values of the same series. To effect this we can make use of the Roman numeral. Thus the series of A. didactic values would be 1, I.; 1, II.; 1, III.; and so on.

Many other details will crop up as we proceed, but we can commence the tabulation of Luke's Gospel, pausing to make any adaptation of arrangement required to bring out any new feature of order which may present itself.

The first point to notice in Luke's Gospel is that there is no parallelism either of narrative or of didactic value in the Nativity stories. The gospel of Jesus Christ does not start before the Baptism, and Table D., which embodies our examination, commences at chap. iii. 21. It is arranged in five columns. The first column A. is for the chapter and verse of any incident, or passages which, from inspection, is a complete whole. The second column B. is for the figures which indicate its didactic value, *i.e.* the number of the series followed by the Roman

numeral already referred to above. For the moment we are little concerned with the Roman numeral, but it will become an important factor in the inquiry of chapters viii. and ix.

The Baptism of Jesus (iii. 21, 22), which opens the gospel of Jesus Christ, is a series 1 idea, corresponding to the (*a*) idea of Table B., which has been summed up in the words, Who is Jesus? It is only one of a series which must itself have a definite order, and, although the place of the Baptism is not yet determined, it is in fact the first, and, consequently, indicated by the Roman numeral I.

From iii. 23 to iv. 15 there is much that needs careful examination before tabulation is possible. Verses 23*b*–38 are of the same category as the Nativity stories. In Matthew the Genealogical Table does find its place in the earlier part of his Gospel. Verse 23*a* and iv. 14, 15, both refer to the teaching of Jesus, which is a series 2 or (*b*) idea. We can note that it is in the order of the pre-synoptic argument, but that neither of these passages contains any didactic value for Theophilus. It is what Jesus taught, not the fact that He did teach, that has any purpose or meaning. The Gospel would be no whit poorer if vers. 14, 15 were eliminated. For such verses as these, then, it is necessary to provide other columns, C. and D., devoted to chapter and verse, and didactic idea respectively, omitting only the Roman numeral, because, when passages have

no didactic value, they can have no place in the series. Presumably they are editorial and not original.

The Temptation is a narrative of a very different kind from the rest of the Gospel. It is didactic ; but it is more comprehensive, and has no parallelism with anything yet noticed in the pre-synoptic argument. We must therefore place it amongst the didactic values of column A., but leave the second column empty, because the two values which we may define as series and stage values are at present undetermined.

Ch. iv., 16–30 is obviously series 2 value. Jesus is again teaching, and, this time, the substance of it is recorded. It is, however, a passage of exceptional peculiarity, containing inconsistency and self-contradiction. As far as ver. 22*a* it very fittingly opens the ministry of Jesus, which the people receive with unanimous approval and joy ; but, from thence onward, the whole atmosphere is changed, and we have a parallel of Matt. xiii. 53–58 = Mark vi. 1–6, an incident placed much later in the narratives. The full meaning of this is examined later, but the suggestion is that we have the fusion of two didactic values. We can note, also, that the story itself follows the pre-synoptic argument ; Luke iv. 22*b* is suggestive of the question, Who is Jesus ? vers. 25–27 offer a parallelism with the idea of series 3, while vers. 28–30 recall series 4, the power of Jesus over evil. They are minor values, subsidiary to the

major story in which they occur, and are noted in columns C. and D.

The didactic value of vers. 31–37 is series 4, and again the separate verses suggest fragments of the pre-synoptic argument so far reached. In vers. 31, 32, there is a setting of teaching—the series 2 idea. In fact, to the end of chapter iv. these two ideas of Jesus' power and of His preaching are the sole subject-matter, but the only additional didactic value is the curing of the fever of Peter's mother-in-law. Verses 40, 41 are of a general character, repeating vers. 31–37, while 42 and 43 refer back to 14 and 15, with the slight but significant difference that the glad tidings must be given to other cities also. Taken in conjunction with ver. 44, we should naturally conclude that Jesus meant other cities of Galilee; but we have just read in vers. 14, 15 that He had only come back from a tour of all the region of Galilee, and, judging from the pre-synoptic argument, which we take to be the real authority, the other cities mean the wider range of country altogether which is suggested by series 7. It is, however, a comparatively unimportant point, for the verses have no didactic value. In any case they terminate the first N.P. of Luke.

In reviewing the N.P. we find that we have five didactic values—1, 2, 2, 4, 4—arranged in the order of the pre-synoptic argument, but not consecutively. The N.P. is of a very similar nature to those of Table B; but in this case we have gone more into

detail, with the result that we find that the passages themselves tend to follow this same sequence. This is brought out by column D., and, if our estimate of vers. 42, 43 be correct, the N.P. carries the argument on to series 7, which is very near the end as far as we yet know it.

The object, then, of ver. 44 is to open the second N.P. by the suggestion of series 2. To take the verse literally and historically strikes at the root of the method of examination, which is to see how far the Gospel can be interpreted by what may be called Matthew's A.–H. series. The order is a didactic, not a historical chronology, which means that people and places have to be interpreted according to didactic values of a religious nature.

The first didactic value in the second N.P. is vers. 1–11, a passage peculiar to Luke, but evidently parallel with Matt. iv. 18–22 which, in Table B., has the (*c*) value, and here must be series 3. Luke v. 12–vi. 11 is a close parallel with Mark i. 40–iii. 6, and the same didactic value must be given in Luke as in Mark's N.P. of Table B., at the same time detailing in columns C. and D. such minor values as form fragments of any incident. It is, however, necessary to enter more into detail. Mark ii. 13–22 is really composed of three didactic items, two of which are feasts, and one—the parable of the garments and skins—belongs to some at present unknown group of didactic values which have been called (*x*), but which subsequent examination will reveal as 9*a* III.

It will be observed that column B. again shows the pre-synoptic sequence of idea, and that this second N.P. fills most of the gaps of the first ; at the same time column D. repeats the sequence on a small scale.

The narrative now returns upon itself once more, and opens another N.P. with the choosing of the Twelve. This incident has not been given any didactic value in Table B., but the calling together of the disciples has such an obvious parallelism of idea with the call of the four that they must belong to the same series 3. The setting of the incident is the mountain where Jesus went to pray (ver. 12), which repeats a usual setting for series 1 (cp. Luke iii. 21 and ix. 28). It concludes with the reference to Judas who was the traitor (ver. 16), and the narrative goes on to add that people from a wide district, even outside Palestine, came to Jesus seeking " to touch Him, for power came forth from Him." These vers. 17–19 are on a par with iv. 42, 43. They are of a general character, and suggest that the ministry of Jesus was for Gentiles as well as Jews, and, like the earlier general remark, may well bear the series 7 value. The correctness of this conclusion is made practically certain by the parallelism of ver. 19 with Mark v. 28–30 which, in Table B., has the (*g*) or series 7 value.

From ver. 20 to ver. 49 we have some teaching which is quite outside the A.–H. series ; but it is followed by series 7 and 8, and thus appears as a

block of unfamiliar teaching between two series 7, suggesting that this is part of the message that Jesus said He must preach to other cities also. It certainly seems probable that these references to those who are not Jews—those who sought to touch Jesus, and the Centurion—and these sayings of vi. 20–49, which were written for the Gentiles, have a definite purpose in their arrangement: in ver. 26 the fathers of the Jews are called "their fathers," implying another people than those addressed.

Such inquiries are, however, outside our immediate purpose, and for the moment the Sermon on the Plain can appear as an inserted block of unrelated teaching. Such a proceeding, at any rate, enables the sequence of the third N.P. to be readily seen. It follows the pre-synoptic argument from series 3 to series 8 in progressive order, and returns on itself at vii. 18 with the question of John.

The commencement of Luke's fourth N.P. is parallel with Matthew's third. It therefore opens with series 1 and 2; but we must now examine more closely the discourse which follows, and which, in Matthew, was treated as an intrusion into the N.P.

The tone of Luke vii. 24–35 is condemnatory of the Pharisees and Judaism generally; even John is less than the little in the kingdom; and, of the passages so far considered, there is sufficient parallelism of language and idea between the discourse and

the healing of the paralytic (v. 16–26) to warrant them being placed in the same series. The discourse accords with the idea of series 5 of the pre-synoptic argument as far as we know it, which suggests that Judaism is not the means of salvation.

The rest of the N.P. is peculiar to Luke, yet the sequence of the pre-synoptic argument is still preserved. Mark and Matthew, in passages peculiar to themselves, give a long discourse about eating with unwashed hands, followed by the healing of the Syrophœnician woman's daughter. The conclusion of Luke's fourth N.P. follows on parallel lines. In place of the discourse on eating, we have the actual feast at Simon's house; and instead of Matt. xv. 28 we have Luke vii. 50, with which it is identical in teaching. We have thus the two series 6 and 7 represented in the N.P. But Luke also follows on the lines of his second N.P., and attaches a parable to the series 6 value, with the addition, in this case, of what looks like an insertion (viii. 1–18) between two N.Ps.

It may be that the Sower parable is a true series 2 item. The seed is the Word of God which Jesus is sowing. In that case it opens the fifth N.P. Verses 19–21 which follow have in Mark (Table B.) the (*c*) value, or series 3, and Luke's expression, "My mother and brethren are these which hear the word of God and do it," follows most fittingly after the parable about the Word of God. It is certainly a more suitable place than before the

parable, as in Mark. With this exception the N.P. follows almost exactly on the lines of Mark's second N.P., and, like the fourth N.P., has a few added verses (ix. 1–6, 10) apparently inserted between the N.Ps. The raising of Jairus' daughter is the end of the argument as we know it, while Herod's question is a fresh beginning.

From ix. 7–43*a* we have three short N.Ps., which it is hardly necessary to follow through in detail. Verses 7–9 and 18–21 are obvious parallels of series 1, while the Transfiguration has much in common with the Baptism. In Table B. the feeding of the five thousand is a (*b*) value, or series 2 item; ix. 22 has its parallelism of idea in the resurrection of Jairus' daughter, and 37–43*a*, by parallelism in language, show their original association with series 7; while, inserted between the seventh and eighth N.Ps., we have another unknown didactic element similar to the two already noticed.

The examination of Luke has carried us on to a later period, chronologically speaking, than Table B. It has included practically the whole of the so-called Galilean ministry, and as far as ix. 43*a*, with the exception of a few verses, which have every indication of insertion between N.Ps., the narrative follows what we have called the pre-synoptic argument without break in eight N.Ps. Whatever the rest of the Gospel may tell us, these earlier chapters at any rate must be based on, and find interpretation in, that

Argument, and when re-arranged must approximate more nearly to the source.

From this point onward the character of the Gospel suddenly changes. Vivid stories give place to personal interviews and parables; healing of diseases to the health of the soul. We have still some two-thirds of Luke's Gospel unexamined, but we can proceed with the very legitimate expectation that the rest of the narrative will return upon itself in a similar manner to the first eight N.Ps., and that we shall be able to reconstruct what, for all practical purposes, will be the Pre-Synoptic Gospel.

CHAPTER IV

TABLE C.

Apart from any legitimate inference as to the character of the source which we may make from Table B., Table A. informs us that this parallelism of order extends to the later chapters of the Gospel. Thus, if the source of the whole Gospel is an orderly repetition of the logical argument of Matthew's A.–H. plus *x* idea, it must be possible to make a reconstruction of something very like the source from which the Synoptists built up their gospels, by bringing together such passages as are parallel in language and idea, and by arranging their groups or series in such order as will produce a logical sequence of argument. Furthermore, if our interpretation of Luke's prefatorial remark to Theophilus be correct: that his order was a re-arrangement of this consecutive sequence—series 1–8 plus *x* into N.Ps., where the didactic idea is always in progressive order, but not necessarily consecutive, after the manner of the first eight N.Ps.—we shall be able to complete Table D.

But such a reconstruction would entail a premature exegetical examination of the whole Gospel, and, however valuable chapters viii. and ix. may be

as practical demonstrations of the truth of the arrangement of the Gospel into Symbolical and Didactic Portions, they could be stigmatized as begging the question if they were the sole, or even the primary, reason for such re-arrangement. Judging from series *x* in Table B., it is to the discourses or Q element of the Gospel that we must turn for its component didactic values and argument. In this direction a peculiar feature of Luke, often called the Peræan ministry, which is composed almost exclusively of the Q element, offers the best field. It is fortunate, too, that his order enables us to follow on directly from the 1–8 sequence.

In Table C. in the Appendix the 205 verses of Luke, from ix. 43 to xiii. 30, have been arranged in four columns. It is a sufficiently large portion to free us from the chance of coincidence of order, and, at the same time, to afford a real test of the existence of a similar arrangement in Q as was found in Mark.

We must now adopt other names to avoid confusion, for it is evident that we are applying a different meaning to these terms Mark and Q from that of the Two-Document theory. They stand for sources ; but series 1–8 and *x* represent different qualities of teaching. Series 1–8 are of a descriptive character ; while series *x* is instructive, and the question of the sources, in the sense of the Two-Document theory, does not enter into our inquiry. To meet this possibility of confusion, we must

rename the series 1–8 the Symbolical Portion, and x the Didactic Portion.

In our review of series x, we must be sure that we are dealing with the Didactic Portion, or we cannot expect any didactic sequence to emerge, and, for this reason, must exclude all passages of doubtful originality or place; *e.g.* ix. 49–62 belongs to the Symbolical Portion, for we have already found that Matt. viii. 18–22, a chronological parallel (see Table B.), has his (*c*) value which corresponds with series 3. Luke is here much more complete than Matthew, and has three similar incidents.

There are four other passages in Table C. that it is necessary to exclude: two, in series 11 and 14, are infiltrations from Matthew of a severe anti-Jewish type which analysis can show to be original in his Gospel, but not in Luke and two others, xi. 14–15 and xiii. 1–17 of doubtful originality. Chapter xi. 14, 15, is not a symbolical value and has parallelism with series 14; but, when we compare it with its chronological and idea parallels, we have ample confirmation of its misplaced or corrupt character. Matt. xii. 22, 23 calls the man blind as well as dumb, and repeats the miracle with more detail in ix. 27–34; but they all spring from Luke xviii 35–43.

Luke xiii. 1–17, the other doubtful passage, offers close parallelism with the symbolism of series 6: vers. 10–17 are very like a doublet of vi. 6–11, while vers. 1–5 are peculiar to Luke, and unlike anything else in the Synoptics. There is justification, then,

for a suspension of judgment upon the verses enclosed within brackets in Table C., and attention can be confined to the order and didactic intention of the rest.

With these exceptions, the columns give us a sequence of ideas which, like the symbolical sequence, is a self-contained and logical argument. The connecting link of the block with the 1–8 order is the healing of the son of the man from the multitude (ix. 37–43*a*), which is a series 7 value ; and at once we have the application of order to criticism, which affords an example of its usefulness. The next value 8 is resurrection from the dead, and the difference between the chronological parallels Matt. xvii. 22, 23 = Mark ix. 30–32 = Luke ix. 43*b*–45 is the omission by Luke of any reference to the death and resurrection of Jesus. His Gospel stops short at the idea of service. The explanation is that he gives it a similar value to ix. 46–48 which immediately follows, about the necessity of serving Jesus with the direct simplicity of a little child, while Matthew treats the passage as series 8. From the catechetical point of view, and read in the light of Matt. x. 40–42, the idea underlying Luke ix. 48 is service—metaphorically giving the cup of cold water—or, in the light of the parallel saying in Matt. xx. 22, 23, drinking the cup. This is exactly what Jesus did when He was delivered up into the hands of men. He served to the uttermost. " Not My will but Thine be done " (Luke xxii. 42), He said, when asking for the removal

of the cup. The idea, then, underlying series 10 is service, and vers. 43*b*–48 contain two passages covered by it.

In the Table the passages have been allocated to their various didactic ideas, but there can be little question about its correctness. If it be examined it will be found that it cannot be altered in any essential particular and still preserve the parallelism in idea of the passages on the same line. The parables and illustrations of line 9 might be placed after line 10 ; but such a change would not interfere with the logical sequence of argument, and they certainly make the better opening or introduction. Item 15 might be placed after 16, but it would be very arbitrary when judgment makes the more fitting close.

The common idea of series 9 is its presentation, either actual or implied, of two types of men : he who will gain the kingdom of God with the reward of eternal life, and he who will not. It follows very much on the lines of series 5 and 6 of the Symbolical Portion. The parallelism on line 12, when read in the light of Matt. xvi. 1–4, needs no comment. The difficulty is in the meaning of its central idea of signs. The three passages on line 13 all deal with Satan ; those immediately following on line, or series 14, are all concerned with the kingdom of God, and a somewhat mystical presentation of the opening of the understanding to receive it, wrapped in such metaphors as light and sight. Of series 11, two of

the passages find their parallels placed in the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. vi. 25–34 = Luke xii. 22–31 and Matt. vi. 9 ff. = Luke xi. 1–4). The contradictory teaching of xi. 3 and xii. 29 does not disprove the parallelism of idea ; it only emphasizes the necessity for inquiry into what lies behind the many paradoxes of the Gospel. The common idea is instruction in the gospel of service to those who set out on their spiritual pilgrimage, of which the Mission of the Seventy can very well be an allegorical presentation.

As in the case of the 1–8 sequence, it is possible to add to these passages already tabulated. The parallelism of xviii. 15–17 with ix. 46–48—the 10 value—and of xviii. 18–30 with x. 25–37—the 9 value—have already been noted in Table A. To aid in an understanding of the meaning of signs, it is very obvious that such passages as xvii. 22–25, xxi. 25–27, and 29–32 belong to the same didactic series as xii. 54–56. They all have a reference to natural phenomena, and have a didactic force culminating in xxi. 25–27. They foreshadow the coming of the Son of Man which, according to the Table, does not mean the Parousia, but the judgment of line 16.

To this judgment, series 16, there are many possible additions which, by parallelism of language and idea alone, require a place here, and sound that same note of progressive revelation which we have already found expressed in series 12, quite apart from any suggestion that an examination of the order of Luke

might give. They are chiefly parables. In the parable of the Houses we can note that Matt. vii. 21–27 is a fusion of much that is in Luke xiii. 22–30 and vi. 46–49. And it is only necessary to read over the parables of the Unrighteous Steward (xvi. 1–13), the Ten Pounds (xix. 11–27), the Great Supper (xiv. 15–24), and the Wicked Husbandmen (xx. 9–18) to see the idea of judgment running through them all. The doublet xii. 11, 12 = xxi. 12–15 suggests the addition of xxi. 12–19 to series 15, and xiv. 26, 27, 33, with the parallelism of idea to xxi. 16–19, is a third passage which can be included under the general idea of the follower's motive. And when Jesus is the great proto-type of humanity, it is quite within the scope of that idea to add xxiii. 39–43 with the confession of the malefactor on the lines of xii. 8.

The above analysis, although very incomplete, is sufficient for the purpose of bringing out the didactic argument. If we read the ideas in the order in which they appear in the Table, we find that there is a logical sequence, complete in itself, which could very well be the framework upon which the Didactic Portion of the Gospel was originally built. And the only possible explanation of this return of the narrative upon itself in these four N.Ps. of Table C. is that the redactor's source was arranged in the order of the didactic argument.

When Luke's Gospel is read in our modern version, it presents to us a series of links or broken chains

of argument of great similarity, which have the peculiarity of being always laid out in the progressive order of the argument; *e.g.* the first N.P. of Table C. is composed of links whose value is in the progressive order 10, 11, 13, 14; the second is 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15; the third is 9, 11, 16, and the fourth 12, 13, 14, 16. It is impossible for such a selection to have been made unless the 9–16 order had been before the redactor.

CHAPTER V

TABLE D.: NINTH TO TWENTY-SECOND N.P.

We can now turn to Table D., having with us what we have every warrant for believing is the complete key to Luke's order of writing. We have found that his first eight N.Ps. cover only half of the complete argument. In these first chapters the teaching is given in a series of vivid incidents which, unless they are symbolical, are gross exaggerations of some simple events. But when, by a symbolical interpretation, every detail of a story selected from a particular series is illuminated, and every story in its turn illuminates the series by adding meaning of a deeply religious character, we ought to accept that symbolical interpretation. The alternative, if we want to see the original truth, is to strip off exaggeration, only to find that there is nothing left.

To distinguish the second half of the pre-synoptic argument from the first, it has been called Didactic. As a matter of fact, the whole Gospel is didactic, but we can now apply the term more definitely to this portion because it avoids the intervention of symbolism. We can carry on the same principle of examination as in the Symbolical Portion and start a new N.P. whenever the didactic idea repeats.

Luke's Gospel, for the second nine chapters, is largely didactic. There are slight complications at the opening of the ninth and tenth N.Ps., due to the fact that, at the point of contact between the two portions, there is a certain hesitation as to didactic values. It is at such a place that we should expect displacement in the order, with ambiguity in the meaning of incidents. We are witnessing the transition from one kind of teaching to another. The two kinds were originally separate, but have a complementary relationship, and often cover the same ground from different points of view.

At this point of juncture there are five incidents: two of which are didactic, of series 10, and three symbolical. The most probable explanation of this arrangement is that they have come together through the mistake of some reviser of identifying what is complementary with what is in series. And, if that be the true explanation, it will be seen that the whole passage (Luke ix. 43*b* to x. 24) appears as a single N.P.

A certain amount of reconstruction is, however, necessary. The original teaching of the mission of the Seventy is to be found in x. 4–7. Verses 1–3 are narrative setting, which follow the progressive order of the Symbolical Portion, and vers. 8–16 are corruptions which find no place in the teaching, and, as far as Luke is concerned, little in the nature of parallel saying. From the third N.P. we are led to believe that vi. 20–49 was an interpolation from

the Didactic Portion, and no place is more suitable for it than between ix. 48 and 49. The "little child" has given up all for the kingdom. He is what the "poor" stand for, and, as a consequence, he is the greatest in the kingdom of God. Then follows, "Blessed are ye poor, for yours is the kingdom of God" (vi. 20), and we see now why the disciples of vi. 17 were a multitude. They were the Seventy, not the Twelve, who, after these instructions, are sent out on their way.

With the above explanation about the series 3 items, and the transposition of vi. 20–49, ix. 43*b* to x. 24 form two N.Ps.—the ninth and the tenth—which follow perfectly the didactic order of argument.

The eleventh N.P. extends to xii. 12. It opens with three parables belonging to series 9*a* and *b* There are two interpolations—xi. 14, 15 and 37–54—neither of which is pre-synoptic. The chief peculiarity is in ver. 16. It is not found in Matthew's Gospel, and apparently has been inserted to indicate the correct place of the series 12 item which appears later in the chapter.

The twelfth N.P. as far as xii. 53 offers no difficulty, but it is possible to give the remaining verses 54–59 a twofold value. Reading them through without reference to their parallelism with other sayings, we should be inclined to place them in the Judgment series, 16, which would be perfectly in order. The idea of judging is conveyed by ver. 56, and the judge is mentioned in ver. 58. It is very

probable that the latest revisers of Luke's Gospel gave them that place in the narrative under that mistaken impression.

The parallelism, however, of these verses with other passages dealing with signs and Satan forbids such an arrangement, and it is more in harmony with the Pre-Synoptic Gospel that these verses should open the thirteenth N.P. If we consider xii. 54–59 and xiii. 1–17 as consecutive parallels covering two series, they have their correct value. It is similar to the more obvious consecutive parallelism of Matt. xxvi. 3–19, where vers. 3–13—the plot against Jesus and the feast at the house of Simon the leper—are parallel with the consent of Judas to betray Jesus, and the preparation for the Last Supper. We now find that xiii. 10–17 is incorrectly assessed, and is a symbolical intrusion into this Didactic Portion.

In chaps. xiii. 10–17 and xiv. 1–6 we have two incidents, which are clearly symbolical, of series 6. They contradict the didactic character of this second portion of Luke. They are, however, except in the nature of the disease and the framework, a doublet. In fact, the two incidents, with Luke vi. 6–11 = Mark iii. 1–6 = Matt. xii. 9–14, form a triplet, and, if doublets are an indication of misunderstanding on the part of the redactor, how much more must the threefold repetition be! Luke vi. 6–11, which is given by all the Synoptics, falls correctly into the order of the symbolism.

The other two are not correctly placed, and very probably are not original. Furthermore, xiii. 10–17, by the order of the narrative, falls into series 13, and the allusion to Satan suggests that it has been adapted to teaching about the kingdom of Satan.

Chapter xiii. 1–5 are frankly a difficulty from every point of view, and have been left as a kind of setting for the parable which follows.

The only remaining item calling for special consideration is xiii. 31–35. From this point onward the symbolical teaching of series 8 is given last in the N.P.—that is, after series 16. The redactor's object is to avoid the anachronisms in his narrative which the historization of the didactic and symbolical counterparts into one continuous story is bound to create. Instead of the order being 1–16, it is now 1–7, 9–16, 8.

For the next three chapters and a half there is a break in the order. We have a block composed chiefly of parables, with a few symbolical passages. Of the latter, xiv. 1–6 has already been referred to as more correctly given in vi. 6–11. Other symbolical items are xvi. 14–18, a corrupt and incomplete passage, and xvii. 11–19, the healing of the Samaritan leper.

There is no apparent corruption in this last passage. And, unless there has been some confusion in the minds of later revisers, or association between it and the parable of the Good Samaritan of series 9*b*, there seems no valid reason for its

presence in this context. Series 9*b* illustrates series 11. The story fits quite correctly into this order, and, as it is one of the few intrusions of a symbolical character into the Didactic Portion, there is some justification for assuming that the miracle has no business here, and that it has incorrectly been given the value of the parable.

Notwithstanding this break in the order, and the intrusion of symbolical items, there are several didactic passages which appear as intervening between two N.Ps. ; and it is not an unwarrantable assumption that they are the wreck of the fourteenth N.P.

After the above explanation about xvii. 1–19, the fifteenth and sixteenth N.Ps. offer little difficulty. With the exception of the story about the Pharisee and Publican, and Zacchæus's attempt to see Jesus, we have two perfectly correct N.Ps. But xviii. 9–14 is a symbolical item of series 5, and the reason for its presence is similar to the intrusion of the illustrations of series 9 into the symbolical order. There is nothing parabolic about it. It is simple teaching of the need for justification by faith not by Judaism, and it has been called a parable owing to its didactic context.

The story of Zacchæus is of a different type. It is placed between series 14 and 16, and the inference is that it was confused by some reviser with the teaching of series 15, the purpose of which is to emphasize the need for a right motive in confessing

Christ. Zacchæus, by his action, did confess Christ; but that is only a side issue of the story, the purpose of which is to compare the Gentiles who accept Christ with the Jews who do not. They are the stones raised up as children to Abraham. It belongs to an earlier series in the pre-synoptic argument.

Like the Symbolical Portion, this Didactic Portion covers eight N.Ps., and, save for the disorder of the fourteenth N.P., and its points of contact with the thirteenth and fifteenth, the N.Ps., almost without exception, are formed of a selection from the eight didactic series made in the progressive order of the argument. When exceptions do occur, they confirm, rather than not, the conclusion that originally the middle portion of Luke was exclusively didactic.

From xix. 29 to the end of the Gospel the N.Ps. are both Symbolical and Didactic. They cover the whole pre-synoptic sequence of idea, which we must now remember is to be written in the order 1–7, 9–16, 8.

The two important features of the seventeenth N.P. are the inserted items of xx. 1–18, and the misplacement of xx. 27–40. The later passage affords a very good illustration of how changes have been made by revisers of the original redactor's handiwork. There can be no doubt that its didactic value is series 5. It is incorrectly placed between series 15 of one stage and the first of the next, and we see at once how the hidden meaning has been

lost and the re-arrangement of order made. Another subject than the Resurrection would have served just as well to illustrate the uselessness of Judaism ; but it is the illustration that has been seized upon as containing the didactic value. It has been assumed to be that of series 8, and, for that reason, the passage has been placed at the end of the N.P. It is illustrations like this that evidence the lateness of the corrupting influences. The original redactor displays too much knowledge to have made such a mistake.

The remaining N.Ps., eighteen to twenty-two, require no comment. They offer no exception to the method of progressive selection from the pre-synoptic order. Table D., then, gives us evidence of twenty-two N.Ps., eight of which are Symbolical, eight are Didactic, and six are Symbolical and Didactic. In other words, we have fourteen *complete* N.Ps., or just twice as many as there are stages, and the only possible conclusion is that Luke's idea of order was a systematic re-arrangement of the pre-synoptic sequence.

CHAPTER VI

THE GOSPEL FOR CATECHETICAL INSTRUCTION

Before starting on a more detailed examination of the various passages which an abstract from Table D. informs us can be allocated to the 16 series, it will perhaps be helpful, and certainly not out of place, to try and visualize some of the conditions of writing which a natural inference from the facts, so far obtained, permits.

The difference between the Symbolical and the Didactic is the explanation of the different character of the first nine from the second nine chapters of Luke; or, more particularly, chaps. iii. 21 to ix. 43*a* and ix. 43*b* to xix. 27. Of this second portion, from chaps ix. 51 to xviii. 15, Mark has no parallel. As far as Luke ix. 43*a*, if we exclude the super-imposed verses, ix. 23–27, the Sermon on the Plain, and the illustrations, chaps. vii. 41–43 and v. 36–39, the whole of the narrative is teaching by symbolism. Luke ix. 43*b* to xix. 27 are almost entirely didactic. They cover those series which are excluded from the earlier portion; and in every case where an incident intrudes, and, by parallelism in its language, obviously belongs to the earlier series, there is such change in its language, or other indication, as to inform us

that it is either a misplacement, an editorial mistake, or superimposed teaching.

Presumably there was a proto-Luke, the redactor of which had two sources. He used one exclusively in the first portion of his Gospel, and the other in the second; and the Gospel which we possess is the work of a later generation, which has been subjected to many corrupting influences. These influences involve the consideration of the whole of the New Testament, and are too extensive and complicated to be discussed here; but Matthew was in existence before the final redaction of Luke, and many of the breaks in the systematic arrangement of Luke are due to Matthew's influence.

The Didactic Portion of the Pre-Synoptic Gospel is not a list of sayings only, for which we can give no better reason than that it was separately edited. It is a distinct kind of teaching. And it seems fairly clear that there must have been some relationship between what was didactic and what was symbolical, and that they had different functions to perform. It is therefore not an unwarrantable conclusion that the source of our Gospels was catechetical instruction for two distinct types of individual, in which the teaching of the New Gospel was set out in a series of stages, or steps, progressively revealing the mysteries of the kingdom of God.

The whole Gospel was for instruction; thus the explanation for the two portions ought to be found in those who were taught rather than in the teaching.

The dual presentation of the teaching must have been due to age, intelligence, or qualification of the hearers. Possibly the Symbolical Portion was meant for the young, and only after years of discretion were reached, or proved ability to understand made evident, was the use of the Didactic Portion permitted by those in authority in the Early Church. The dividing line could hardly have been more pronounced than this because of the intimate relation between the two blocks. In many cases the didactic is obviously the complement of the symbolical, and, after the entry into Jerusalem, the Synoptists are agreed that there is only one order (1–16) without break, save for the ordinary gaps which are due to the narrative form that it assumes.

The purpose, then, of the Didactic Portion was for more advanced teaching: to meet the needs of those who were found capable of understanding the deeper truths. This is exactly what the Gospel suggests. Luke viii. 10 is a difficult saying to understand in its context; but the double-series value, (2) and (14), which it can be given in Luke, suggests an explanation: "Unto those that are without all things are done in parables"; in other words, the teaching is symbolical only, and the parable of the Sower has a series 2 value for the young and uneducated: "Unto you ('the disciples') is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom," and for these the value is series 14. The mystery is revealed to those who are "within," in contradistinction to

those who are "without." The saying of Jesus, Luke viii. 10, does not refer to the interpretation of the Sower parable only. It is not that comparatively simple story which is so hard to understand, but the whole of the symbolism which the didactic element is meant to reveal. The difference in teaching might be such as that between learning a difficult poem by heart, and understanding it. The strange thing is that it is the babes who are "within," reminding us again of that little child whom the disciples (in this case the Judaizers) were bidden to copy (Luke ix. 48).

In writing Luke, the redactor was making public what had hitherto been secret. We need not conjecture why publication should be considered necessary. What concerns us, for the moment, is the method, and how it was published. The mysteries themselves could never be made public, and the device adopted was to derange the order of the incidents. It was not, however, done in a haphazard manner. The one hundred and odd incidents were not shuffled like a pack of cards, but dealt out according to a system. To all appearance there is little difference between the results which the haphazard and systematic methods may produce. Both completely hide the underlying order, yet the latter is capable of analysis, as in Table D.; the former is not. The redactor's method was always to select the incidents for his narrative, and write them down in the order of the argument, *i.e.*

in the order of series 1–16, but not necessarily consecutively.

With this information reconstruction of the Source is possible. Even if the items of narrative were indiscriminately shuffled, it would only be a matter of labour and patience. But when we do know the system by means of which the disarrangement is brought about, it makes the problem very much easier. There is a relation between didactic values and the order in which they are written in our Gospels which affords valuable help in bringing out order from the existing chaos.

How the Pre-Synoptic Gospel came into being is, as yet, a matter of speculation only. We may think of it as a book of an esoterical nature; but it is very doubtful if it were a book at all. One of the difficulties of the Synoptic Problem is that the source, if it were written, is so frequently ignored. It can hardly have been used in such varying accounts as Matt. ix. 20–22 = Mark v. 25–34 = Luke viii. 43–48. The "Triple Tradition" in the Greek of those passages only accounts for fourteen words, and many of them are conjunctions and articles, which any stories must have in common. In the Revised Version, Matthew has 66 words, Mark 190, and Luke 144, yet each account embodies the essential features of the story. This is characteristic of many passages in the Gospels, which casts considerable doubt on the sufficiency of the assumption that the source was documentary.

To sum up conclusions briefly and obtain a comprehensive view of the Pre-Synoptic Gospel, it is only necessary to refer to the index of series and stage and the Gospel of Luke re-arranged in pre-synoptic order given in Appendix E. With the exception of a few passages of an obviously late date, such as those referring to the destruction of Jerusalem, and some strictures on the Jews, the Gospel of Luke iii. 21, 22 and iv. to xxiv. is tabulated, and it will be noted that it forms itself into two portions—the Symbolical, series 1–8, and the Didactic, series 9–16—while the passages forming the series are arranged in seven vertical columns. These columns are called stages, whose characteristics are strict parallelism in idea and order of expression, and a progressive revelation of the idea as the stages ascend. Running through them is a common argument which can be called the Pre-Synoptic Argument and can be summarized as follows :

SYMBOLICAL PORTION

Series

1. Announcement of Jesus ultimately revealed as the Son of God.
2. He comes to proclaim the New Gospel : the Bread of Life.
3. He calls all men to follow Him.
4. He demonstrates His power over evil, and, apparently, is overcome by it.
5. He teaches that the first step to attainment of the kingdom is repudiation of the old religion
6. And under the symbolism of feasting gives the picture of those who are justified.
7. These are the Gentiles : it is they who attain : through faith they are made whole.
8. Complete victory over evil by Resurrection and Ascension.

DIDACTIC PORTION

Series

9A. The seven parables, or illustrations, of the teaching of series 5 and 6.

9B. The seven parables, or illustrations, of the teaching of series 11.

10. The Gentiles are the children: they are the least who are great: the last who are first: the servants like Jesus.

11. The principles of life's action, or Christ within.

12. The signs of the coming of the Son of Man in Judgment: the stimuli of faith.

13. The kingdom of Satan: the trial of faith.

14. The kingdom of God, and the opening of the understanding: the justification of faith.

15. The importance of right motive in following Jesus.

16. The Judgment of Mankind.

The sevenfold repetition of this argument, or the Pre-Synoptic Gospel, was evidently esoterical, hidden from the world; and of history there is no trace. The setting of Palestine does not exist. Time and place are features with which it has no concern. It is purely and simply religious instruction. And it is with the knowledge of this book, or, if not a book, with the knowledge of the order and system of teaching here indicated, that the compiler of proto-Luke set out to write his Gospel.

The only reasonable explanation of the sevenfold repetition of the argument is that it was for catechetical instruction. If the suggestions just put forward are in any sense correct, we should expect that the disciple would be first instructed into the Symbolical Portion, and initiated, stage by stage, into the mysteries of the Gospel—that is, in what may be called the vertical direction of the re-arrangement of Luke (Appendix E.). First stage

I. of series 1–8 would be taken, then stage II., and so on. Many, no doubt, would progress no further than the Symbolism. And it would only be on a satisfactory comprehension of it that the Didactic Portion would be undertaken and instruction carried on.

When the Pre-Synoptic Gospel is read in the vertical direction there are many contextual features which emerge which are important and illuminating ; but, considering that the extent of the parallelism between individual items of each series is hardly yet established, it is essential that any examination which is made should be in what may be called the horizontal direction of Luke's re-arrangement, *i.e.* series by series. It is in this manner that the examination of chapters viii. and ix. will be carried on.

We can now understand the paradoxical situation of the disorder of Luke, and his claim to be writing in order. He is hiding the mystery by a systematic disarrangement of its passages. Modern criticism has fully realized that the Gospels are not the simple narratives that they were once thought to be, and that there are depths of teaching in them that all our efforts have not yet been able to fathom. In this 1–16 order we seem to be carried backward in the first century, many years, to a period earlier than the Epistles, when oral instruction was the method, and when the more sacred nature of the faith, as embodied in the 9–16 sequence, was not fully explained till worthiness for it by a proper

understanding of the 1–8 sequence was made evident.

The great point of newness in this teaching is the coming of the Spirit of God into the hearts of men for their salvation from the power of Evil. It is a repudiation of Judaism. Christianity originated amongst the Hellenistic Jews, who substituted for the Law the Spirit of God. Fruits worthy of repentance are required. The tittles of the Law are meaningless, while judgment is based upon the worth of life.

As we proceed with the examination of the Gospel, it will be seen that the short account of John's mission is essentially the outline of the gospel message. As far as the preaching of Jesus is concerned, many of the reported sayings of John the Baptist are identical with those of Jesus, and have the same symbolical and metaphorical significance. John died the martyr's death, and the next we know is that there is a religion of the Coming One, the Christ, whom John preached. John's message appears as a religious mystery of the existence of the Spirit of God upon earth. It is nothing strange, and is consonant with all Hellenistic religious thought at the time.

Although Luke is the only Gospel with which we are immediately concerned, the other Gospels, particularly Matthew, serve a useful purpose by the assistance they offer in elucidating the metaphor and symbolism. One of Matthew's chief characteristics

is literalization. In other words, he turns metaphor into actual fact, and makes religious mystery history. Not infrequently fragments from several of the component passages of the series are woven into one story or discourse. This latter feature is in itself important evidence of the sevenfold parallelism.

But it is not the intention here to make any separate examination of Matthew and Mark. That must be the concern of some later inquiry. It will, however, be desirable to understand the relationship of the Gospels one to another. Matthew is not, like Luke, dependent upon the Pre-Synoptic Gospel. His Gospel rests upon proto-Luke, the re-arrangement of the Pre-Synoptic Gospel which he has taken the liberty of still further re-arranging, largely for an anti-Jewish purpose, some decades after proto-Luke was written. Our Gospel of Luke is a revision of proto-Luke, after Matthew was written, which incorporates a good deal of Matthew's anti-Jewish material. Mark is still later, but of Eastern, not Western, origin.

The Gospels at the end of the first century were substantially as we have them ; but the severe anti-Jewishisms were not allowed to remain unchallenged in subsequent years, and many small changes were made. These have only served to import confusion into the narrative, and, at times, absolute contradiction. They are really trifling changes, but they have large consequences.

The attitude of approach to the Gospel must be that of the catechumen listening, for the first time, to the revelation of the mysteries of the kingdom of God. Step by step it leads, as it were, from earth to heaven; from this side the veil to that other which exists for humanity as an act of faith.

CHAPTER VII

THE FOUNDER OF CHRISTIANITY

The most obvious objections to the conclusions about the Gospel so far reached is that they throw doubt upon the historicity of Jesus. If the only document which tells us anything about the human personality of Jesus is not history, nor was ever intended to be, Christian origins seem to be without foundations. Yet no intelligent man who has given the question serious thought believes that a new star led the wise men of the East to the cradle of the Son of God; that they talked with Herod; that the heavenly choir sang to the shepherds; or that the infant Jesus confounded the Rabbis of the temple. Nor can any Christian worthy of the name want to purchase his own salvation at the expense of the slaughtered babes of Bethlehem or think that it was part of the divine scheme, foretold by the prophets of old, that there should be weeping and great mourning: "Rachel weeping for her children . . . because they are not." He ought rather to be thankful that the historian who writes with so much detail of Herod's life at this time is silent, and that we can class this story along with the others as not true. These nativity stories are not hard facts of history.

There is, however, quite another line of criticism which not only supplies a personality upon which the history can hang, but makes it impossible that it should be the Jesus of the Gospels. Putting aside the difficulty of reconciling with actual life the "supernatural" acts of Jesus, when we turn to secular history we find a strange silence which, although no evidence that he did not live, is all the more significant when we find ample evidence of John the Baptist.

The Gospel story of John is short, but sufficient. It does not—like so much of the New Testament history—contain counter evidence, in things outside human experience, of its own lack of truth. Instead of those wonderful works which we are tempted to discredit as exaggerations of devoted followers, we have a straightforward story which rings true from beginning to end.

The great value of this story of John is the confirmation it receives from secular history. It is true that those who desire to do so propose to see in Josephus (*Antiquities*, XVIII. v. 2) the work of the interpolater, and it must be admitted that there is quite a natural sequence of ideas without it; but it is just as true that such parenthetical remarks are consistent with Josephus' style, and, failing better reasons, must be accepted.

Herod Antipas has just suffered a serious reverse at the hands of Aretas of Arabia. He has, of course, to report the matter to Tiberias Cæsar, who orders

Vitellius to punish Aretas. Preparations are made; but, when the troops are passing through Judæa, word comes of the death of Tiberias. He died in A.D. 37. Herod's defeat would be in 36, and when it is regarded by the people as a punishment for killing John the Baptist in the prison at Macherus, the death of John cannot have been very much earlier. To think that the people, particularly in such stirring times, would connect the two events if ten years intervened (the period required by the accepted chronology of Jesus) is not only absurd, but out of the question.[1]

It might be objected that 36 is too late for the defeat, because it was occasioned by the "treachery of some fugitives, who, though they were of the tetrarchy of Philip, joined with Herod's army," and, as Philip died in 33–34, the defeat must have been prior to that date. There was, however, no successor appointed to Philip till after the death of Tiberias, and as the Tetrarchy preserved the name of Philip, so the date 36 is in no sense contradicted.

This date of 36 is quite confirmed by the story of John, in Luke. Chapter iii. 1, 2 tells us that it

[1] Dr. Armstrong, in his article on "Herod Antipas" (*Dict. Christ and the Gospels*, p. 721), says: "It is difficult to determine just how soon after the marriage with Herodias the war between Aretas and Herod broke out. . . . The defeat can hardly have been later than A.D. 36." Dr. Armstrong admits the possibility of the date A.D. 36; but he does not attempt to reconcile the difficulties it introduces. From his standpoint it is impossible. The war was occasioned by Herod's intention to divorce Aretas's daughter, not by his marriage after the divorce; and according to Matthew and Mark, John's death did not take place till after the marriage.

was in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberias that the word of God came to him in the wilderness. Tiberias commenced to reign in the autumn of 14. The fifteenth year would end autumn 29 A.D. It would take some time for this unknown man to obtain his reputation. He did not preach sedition, but a righteous life, away from Jerusalem, in the wilderness. His antagonism to the Jewish religious leaders would be a joy, rather than the reverse, to Herod, and some years must have elapsed before he could be considered as a serious menace, let alone for active steps to be taken to imprison him, and eventually kill him. The probabilities then are, according to Luke, that John's death was within a year of Herod's defeat.

But there is quite another aspect of the story. In fact, Josephus, *Ant.* XVIII. iv. 6, v. 1, 2, 3, and 4, and XX. vii. 1, as well as many other passages, are very important in view of the light they throw upon the historicity of the Gospel. The quarrel between Antipas and Aretas arose because, when in Rome, Antipas had fallen in love with his half-brother's wife, Herodias, and made arrangements to divorce his own wife, who was Aretas' daughter, so that he could marry her. This divorce was a condition laid down by Herodias which had to be realized prior to the marriage.

Apparently Herodias was already divorced, and had been since the birth of her daughter Salome. This daughter married her uncle, Herod Philip

(*Ant.* XVIII. v. 4), who died in 33–34 (cp. *Ant.* XVIII. iv. 6), so that she was a widow at this time, and when she was supposed to be dancing before Antipas (Matt. xiv. 3–12 = Mark vi. 17–29).

The plans of Antipas and Herodias were somewhat upset by the knowledge of them coming to the ear of Herod's wife in Judæa. She artfully requested to be sent to Macherus, the place of John the Baptist's prison, and situated in the country subject to her father, to the east of the Dead Sea. She was thus under her father's protection, and could tell him of the plot. The war followed as a natural consequence.

We can now turn to the Gospel narrative. Luke (iii. 19–20) tells us that John was imprisoned because he reproved Herod for Herodias, his brother's wife. This is quite consistent with the story in Josephus, although Josephus gives quite another reason, relating that Herod "feared lest the great influence John had over the people might put it into his power and inclination to raise rebellion. Accordingly he was sent to prison, out of Herod's suspicious temper —to Macherus—and was there put to death." Both these accounts agree with a date for John's death of not earlier than A.D. 36.

Turning now to Matt. xiv. 3–12 = Mark vi. 17–29, we are told that Antipas had imprisoned John because he had told him it was not lawful for him to have his brother *Philip's* wife. Both Matthew and Mark have assumed that Philip the Tetrarch was the husband of Herodias. But he died in 33–34

(*Ant.* XVIII. iv. 6), and we have the absurdity of Salome marrying her father. The only other explanation is that the little-known half-brother, Herod of Rome, was also called Philip, and for that we have not the slightest warrant. We can note that Luke does not call him Philip.

But the generally accepted chronology will not admit of the death of John after the death of Philip the Tetrarch, and we see why his name was mentioned. When the crucifixion was not later than 33, the marriage of Antipas to Herodias, which is the same date as the death of John and the defeat of Antipas, had to be fixed some years earlier.

There is no reliance to be placed on the story of Matthew and Mark. We cannot get over the hard fact that, from Josephus' point of view, the defeat of Antipas, and, from the Gospel point of view, the marriage of Herodias, were both approximately the same date as the death of John, and not earlier than A.D. 36. Even supposing Herod married Herodias before the defeat of his generals —whom, by the way, he did not accompany—he would never take his wife into the lion's jaws by banqueting with his court at Macherus, situated in the actual war zone. That event, if it happened at all, must have taken place later, with the absurd anachronism of John being killed after the defeat which was held to be the punishment for his death.

The facts, then, are that John the Baptist preached in the wilderness of Judæa in the first half

of the fourth decade, but subsequently, not prior to, the date at which Jesus is supposed to be conducting His ministry. According to the generally accepted story, Jesus was born during the reign of Herod the Great, who died in 4 B.C. He was about thirty years old when He began to teach (Luke iii. 23) and spent three years in public ministry before being crucified. In other words, the crucifixion of Jesus synchronizes with the beginning of John's ministry, and the two figures become interchangeable.

It is strange that Josephus did not write about this far more important movement of Jesus. It is true that in *Ant.* XVIII. iii. 3 there is a short reference to Him ; but authorities, for many reasons, have had to conclude that it is an interpolation of another century. Supposing somehow the generally accepted chronology were correct, and John was slain much earlier, and the crucifixion was after his death, but before the defeat of Herod Antipas—why was not the defeat cited as retribution for Jesus' death ? He must have made a much greater stir than John, with His trials before kings and governors, of whom Herod himself was one, and the mysterious cosmic happenings of darkness and earthquakes attendant on His death.

One of the key dates of contemporary times is the reign of Aretas, whose period, according to Dr. Wade (*New Testament History*, p. 345), and substantially agreed to by all authorities, is 33–39. The later date is the ultimate limit for the escape

of Paul from Damascus after his conversion (2 Cor. xi. 32). During the earlier one the mission of John the Baptist was in full swing. John was slain in 36, and into those three years, from John's death to Paul's escape, we have to cram the recovery of the Church from the blow occasioned by his death, the election of James to take his place as leader, the removal of the centre of authority to Jerusalem, the development of persecution, the violence of Saul, his conversion, and his escape from the anger of the Jews which it occasioned. There is no room for the Man Jesus. He is divine. He is God, who was never regarded as a man till many years after John and the early Fathers of the Church were dead.

CHAPTER VIII

THE SYMBOLICAL PORTION

So far in our examination of the Synoptic Gospels, we have reached many conclusions as to the nature of their source and of the character of the Church which possessed it. It may have seemed at times, in the endeavour to present the source in a tangible form and reach concrete results, that there has been a tendency to beg the question, and to clear away difficulties by assumptions which have no sufficient evidence behind them. That this should appear so is inevitable from the nature of the case. We are engaged upon comparing the parallelism of sayings and incidents of what is supposed to be a historical document. But history does not happen in such parallel sequence, and, at the very outset, before anything is considered, the circle is closed, and no truly logical argument is possible because the question is already begged.

Fortunately, however, we are not left without other evidence of the correctness of our conclusions. Through Table D. we have outlined by somewhat arbitrary means a sevenfold parallelism of teaching. The method of attainment is of small importance. The result, no matter how it has been reached, is its

own evidence. No document could be arranged into a parallelism of teaching which was not parallel as a prior condition, and, as far as the Gospel is concerned, the sevenfold parallelism (Appendix E) is so artificial and purposeful that it must be pre-synoptic, with the further conclusion that a Church existed which must have been responsible for the artifice, and be of a type capable of producing it.

To enable us to see the character of this Church, we need to examine the teaching, for what it tells us is the opinion of the leaders and teachers who stand at its head. The inquiry must follow the dual course of making clear the sevenfold parallelism of each series, and the didactic intention of its originators.

The re-arrangement which we have before us is our Gospel of Luke in pre-synoptic order, and allowance will have to be made for the fact that, although it is an approximation to the Pre-Synoptic Gospel, it is Luke in substance.

It will not be possible here to detail all the evidence as to the character of the Early Church or the reasons for the historical setting, and why it took the form it did of a ministry in Galilee and death in Jerusalem. There is much to be derived from other books of the New Testament, and the detailed study of Matthew and Mark; but this must form the subject of later inquiry. For the moment reliance must be placed upon results, and how far they afford an explanation consistent with the facts before us.

The Pre-Synoptic Gospel originated in Alexandria, and lies buried in the origin of Christianity, before strife or heretical opinion had time to grow. Proto-Luke is the result of conflict, and was put forward by the Alexandrian section of the Church to show that the doctrines to which another section, the Palestinian, was tending were a retrogression. Christianity was a New Covenant, entirely free from Judaism; retrogression was the desire to include the old as well, and to treat the new as a reformation of it. To combat such a tendency no more forceful method could be found than to make public what was hitherto a mystery, by turning its sevenfold parallelism into a history of the Early Church, and putting into the mouth of Jesus sayings condemnatory of such views and of the people holding them.

This is the explanation of the extraordinary character of the disciples in the Gospels. They are weak and wayward followers—faithless and perverse. They are typical of the Palestinians, and John the Baptist, who was probably the founder of this portion of the Church, appears as interchangeable with Moses, and seems to stand for Mosaism rather than Christianity.

The parallelism between the various passages of the re-arrangement is evidenced in two ways—first, parallelism of language; and second, parallelism of idea, which may employ very different words. We have to bear in mind that each stage has its own

peculiar purpose, that it is part of a teaching which requires the seven to unfold, that the vehicle for revelation is largely symbolism and metaphor, and that each stage may have some peculiar way of regarding this metaphor. These considerations add considerable complications to the study of the Gospel, but if we find, as a matter of fact, that these didactic items of Luke, which in Table D. have been given a definite place in the re-arrangement, do conform to these complex conditions, the proofs are overwhelming.

Before setting out on this inquiry into the parallelism of series, it will be as well to outline the peculiar character of each stage. It is evident if the sevenfold parallelism is of the nature of seven steps in the revelation of the pre-synoptic argument—the didactic idea of the 1–16 series—that each of the series must follow a similar course. They must be like sixteen step-ladders, with seven similar rises and treads. The nature of each step will become familiar as series after series is separately considered, but, generally speaking, stage I. is of a mystical and even potential character, causing wonder but not understanding by the catechumen. It is anticipatory of much of the final revelation (cp. iv. 22 of series 2, v. 9 of series 3, iv. 36 of series 4, v. 26 of series 5, all of which tell of the amazement of the people ; xiii. 17 and xiv. 6 of series 6 conveying a kindred idea. In vii. 9 of series 7 it is Jesus who marvels, and why the disciples in ix. 21 of series 8

should be commanded to silence is an enigma even for us.

The Didactic Portion is more potential than mystical, yet the hidden character of the teaching is to be observed in ix. 45 of series 10, viii. 10 of series 14, xiv. 35 of series 15, and, as far as the potentiality of sayings is concerned, it is obvious that the Beatitudes require explanation; poverty, hunger, and sorrow are not in themselves blessings.

Stage II. is the beginning of instruction. It contains a simple and elementary statement of the didactic idea; but intervening between it and stage I., and, presumably, meant as a prologue to the Gospel as a whole, we have the Temptation. This is a unique incident without any parallel passage. It is an allegory of the kind of conflict which Jesus wages with Satan, and of the conflict of every man.

Why these temptations take their specific symbolical and metaphorical form remains to be seen, and their meaning no doubt always will remain rather speculative, but it is a sequence of ideas frequently repeated. We shall see it in the Beatitudes, and in the three conditions of discipleship (Luke ix. 57–62, 3 VI.). In this latter Jesus is represented as having nowhere to lay His head, He is poor, He has eaten nothing for forty days. These are symbolical of the idea that the kingdom of God is theirs who earnestly desire it. They hunger, but are filled. And the first temptation of Satan is for

Jesus to use His power to make another kind of bread, and satisfy Himself with that, or hoodwink men with any sort of religion.

The second temptation is similar. Jesus came to bring the kingdom of God into the world, or Light into Darkness. The instrument of this is the gospel, which shows how Satan, the Prince of Darkness, shall be overcome. Satan offers to resign his authority if Jesus will preach another gospel. This is only another form of disobedience to Jesus' command to repudiate the "household gods" (leaving the father to bury himself (ix. 60, 3 VI)).

Whatever the third temptation is supposed to mean, there is certainly a correspondence between the temptation to give up striving for the kingdom—an interpretation which can be given to the words "cast Thyself down hence"—and the third mark of the follower who has to be unshaken in his determination.

In stages III. and IV. the polemical intention of proto-Luke becomes apparent. There are some in the Church who treat Christianity as a reformation of the Jewish religion, and stage III. shows the relation of Mosaism to the particular didactic idea of each series, while stage IV. shows how this section of the Church is not adopting the right attitude, but joining the Jews, whose religion, Judaism, it is the object of stage V. to show up and condemn.

Stage III., generally speaking, deals with the relation of Christianity to Mosaism; stage V. is

related in the same way to Judaism, of which Mosaism is the parent; while stage IV. is intermediate, condemning those who rely upon Mosaism because they eventually accept Judaism.

With stage VI. the outlook broadens. The purpose of the gospel is to overcome evil. So far it has dealt with the evil in the form of other religions which must be repudiated. Now the conflict is with the power of Darkness, Satan himself, who is very much in the ascendant. Stage VII. is the triumph of the good, and the complete revelation.

We can now turn to the 16 series, and, as briefly as possible, outline the evidence which inspection affords of the parallelism of language and idea. It is true that the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and John offer much assistance in this respect; but they will have to form the subject of later inquiry, and it will simplify matters at this point if attention is confined to Luke.

The didactic idea of series 1 is concerned with the personality of Jesus. In stage I. the voice says, "Thou art My beloved Son." No one hears it except Jesus, and we see the mark of stage I.—no one can understand its mystical character and how it anticipates or is potential of the final revelation of stage VII., where Jesus confesses that He is the Son of God.

Actual instruction starts with stage II. It is in the form of a question about Jesus, which does little more than introduce the subject of His personality.

The fact that it is John who asks the question raises serious difficulties from the point of view of history, for he is supposed to have just baptized Jesus. But the purpose of proto-Luke, as already suggested, is to admonish some section of the Church which is departing from one of its fundamental principles, and it is conveyed under the symbol of John's disciples asking who Jesus is.

In the next stage, III., John is dead. It is later in the history of this Church. Its people are now identifying Jesus with the old Jewish leaders, and the story goes on to tell us that Herod did not believe that Jesus was John.

No more substantial evidence of parallelism is necessary than that between stages III. and IV. (Luke ix. 8 = ix. 19). We have now in the later one the introduction of the disciples. Peter says, " Thou art the Christ of God," meaning that he, as the leader of this Church, has adopted the Jewish idea of the Messiah. How untrue the title is when applied to Jesus is revealed by the remaining stages. In stage V. the voice says, " This is My Son, My chosen ; hear ye Him " ; in stage VI. Jesus is not the son of David, He is his Lord ; in stage VII. He is the Son of God.

Little need be said about stages VI. and VII., but stage V. offers a long story. The old prophets referred to in stages III. and IV. are represented as speaking to Jesus, who tells them of His decease about to be accomplished at Jerusalem. Peter is

heavy with sleep, symbolical of his spiritual blindness, and he shows his Judaizing tendency by suggesting that Jesus, Moses, and Elijah should have three tabernacles, and be on an equality. Then, as if to demonstrate the wrong of such a suggestion, the cloud overshadows them, and the voice speaks. "But they held their peace and told no man in those days of the things they had seen." These men were not the true followers of Jesus, and, like the Jews, did not propagate the New Gospel.

In examining this series 1 we have one didactic idea completely revealed, and it will be noted that each stage preserves the peculiar character just given it.

Series 2 follows series 1 as a natural context. Jesus came to bring the gospel. It is good tidings to the poor, release to the captives, sight to the blind. They are words of grace, which are the wonder of the people (iv. 18 and 22, stage I.).

Much the same language is used in stage II.; but actual instruction has now commenced, and it causes no wonder. The catechumen realizes, particularly after the prologue (the Temptation) to this stage, that the message of Jesus is release to the captives from the bonds of Satan, the power of darkness.

With stage III. there is a considerable development. It is now shown how the Word, or the gospel symbolized by the seed, is received. There are four kinds of people with whom proto-Luke is concerned. There is no difference in results as far as the first

two are concerned. Fruit is not produced. But the four categories have each a peculiar meaning, which subsequent teaching will render clear.

As a provisional explanation we can assume that those by the wayside are the Judaizers to whom the Gospel refers as Pharisees. The seed is there for them to take, but they ignore it, and allow Satan to take it away. Those on the rocky ground are the Palestinian Christians, that section of the Church with which proto-Luke is immediately concerned. They received the Word with joy, but have fallen into the error of accepting the old covenant, and are in danger of becoming like the Pharisees.

The rest of the seed falls on good ground, where it brings forth fruit; but weeds are allowed to grow in some places, with the consequence that the fruit is imperfect. These may stand for the ordinary types of believers: one is faithful in all things, the other is of weak faith. We can note that, unlike Matthew, Luke does not give different values to the faithfulness of good men.

In stage IV. we have the picture of those on the rocky ground. They are the Palestinian followers, who, as Jesus enters Jerusalem, receive Him with joy, but in a few short hours join with those who cry "Crucify Him." They understand the teaching of series 2 and the meaning of the mighty works, and accept the seed, the Word, the gospel, and Jesus as the king coming in the name of the Lord, but fall away to Judaism.

Luke iv. 14–30 is typical of the method of proto-Luke. He has here fused the stage I. and V. values into one, and, to avoid the anachronism which ver. 23 would otherwise introduce into the narrative, he preludes the passage, in vers. 14, 15, by mentioning a journey through Galilee which would include Capernaum. But he cannot avoid the contradiction of vers. 22 and 28, and, when Matthew and Mark have parallels of the second half of the incident only (Matt. xiii. 53–58 = Mark vi. 1–6), we are justified in completing Luke's sevenfold parallelism by the division of this passage into two didactic values.

Stage V. deals with those by the wayside (the Jews who are generally referred to as Pharisees) and the way in which they treat the gospel. Without any warrant from the story, Jesus, in iv. 23, denounces these Jews, and, by two illustrations from old times of the way in which the Gentiles even then were an example of faith to the Jews, they are filled with wrath, and seek to kill Jesus.

With stages VI. and VII. there is as usual a wider application given to the didactic idea. The seed is now represented as the Bread of Life. It is typical of faith which grows with its exercise. The story, however, is not without its thrust at the disciples who, from stage III. onwards, stand for the Palestinian section of the Christian Church at the time of proto-Luke. Like the three disciples at the Transfiguration (ix. 36) when " they told no

man of any of the things which they had seen," they said, " send the multitude away." They left Jesus to feed them and propagate His own gospel, and there were as many baskets left over as there were disciples.

The final stage is buried in much of proto-Luke's setting as well as some additions of a later date, but xxiii. 5 contains the parallelism of idea. Jesus was condemned by the Pharisees, the instruments in the setting of the power of Darkness, because He taught from Galilee to Jerusalem that the gospel was the power to vanquish Satan.

There is an abrupt termination to the argument, and its point for the moment is incomplete ; but the series is complete, and follows step by step in accordance with our conceptions of what the stages were meant to unfold.

The argument is resumed in series 3. It is the call to follow Jesus, and pictures how the various sections of the Church carry out His commands. It opens in stage I. with the usual prologue, which covers a good deal of ground. It is a symbolical counterpart of the Beatitudes. Simon Peter is the chief character, but he must not yet be identified with those on rocky ground. Even they were believers to start with. The disciples have been toiling in the darkness, and caught nothing. They are typical of the world before the Light—the Son of God—came. Obedience to Him means satisfaction of " hunger," but it also brings " weeping," or a

knowledge of the darkness which is within. The light makes the darkness visible, and Peter says, "Depart from me; for I am a sinful man, O Lord." The reply of Jesus to him, as to all, is, "Fear not, follow Me, and propagate the gospel."

Stage II. gives a list of the Palestinian disciples. They are called by Jesus to be His followers.

With stage III. the polemical intention again becomes evident. Jesus refuses to see His mother and brethren. It is impossible to think that when this story was first told it was intended to be taken literally, and to represent Jesus as a rude and unkind son. This is not an isolated incident, for it is an almost invariable rule that whenever such family or household ties are mentioned, a similar uncharitable attitude is shown, and from the historical point of view an impossible situation created. But when we regard them as symbolism, when the word *house* stands for religion, and family ties represent the old religions, more particularly Mosaism and Judaism, we have consistent teaching, and agreement, not only with the didactic idea of the series in which they appear, but also with the particular stage characteristic of the series.

In this stage III., the mother and brethren outside the crowd stand for the Mosaizers who are leaving the true fold. The real mother and brethren are those who hear the Word of God—the seed of the Sower—and do it.

Stage IV. develops this idea on the same

lines as in earlier series by a story of John, the Palestinian disciple, rebuking the true follower who is casting out devils in Jesus' name. The Gospel never offers a specific instance of the disciples healing.

With stage V. the disciples are practically identified with the Pharisees. Jesus was on His way to Jerusalem—it is a phrase always indicative of this stage—and because His face was in that direction, or appeared to favour a Jewish form of Christianity, the Samaritans would not receive Him. They were quite right, but James and John wanted to destroy them.

With stage VI. we have a more direct presentation of the symbolism of stage I. It is absurd to think that it was an historical fact that Jesus had no place on which to lay His head, and that He would not have been welcomed by Peter's mother-in-law, or by the wealthy Zebedee who could afford to hire servants, not to speak of many others who had benefited by His services. Jesus, the great prototype, is represented as "poor." He has given up all other desire but that for the kingdom of God, and men must do likewise. To another would-be follower He says: "Do not trouble about the dead body of your father." It is the same symbol as mother and brethren outside the crowd. The old religious ideas must be given up, and there must be fishing for men, or propagating the New Gospel. To a third He says much the same: "Give up those

of your house (your old religious ideas), and follow Me regardless of consequences."

Jesus calls all men to follow Him, and this refrain runs throughout the series; but at the climax of His life it is the centurion, the Gentile, who makes the necessary confession and glorifies God. Stage VII. strikes a note of contrast between disciples and Gentiles which pervades the Gospel, and which is so strange and persistent as to be quite outside the range of coincidence.

The gospel is the plan of God for the salvation of men from Satan, the power of darkness and evil, the actual unfolding of which commences with series 4. The first five stages are a group of miracles in which the power of Jesus is demonstrated. They are all of a similar type, and although the devil does not always appear, the various evils mentioned are manifestations of him. In comparing stages I. and IV., if devil be substituted for tempest, and allowance be made for the difference of setting, they are duplicates.

Parallelism of language is also to be observed between iv. 34 of stage I. and viii. 28 of stage V.; and, as Jesus rebuked the devil and the tempest, so He rebuked the fever of stage II.

At the same time stage characteristics are also preserved. The amazement of iv. 36 is consistent with stage I. Stage II. is short and simple, and the woman showed the character of the true follower by immediately rising up and serving.

Stage III. introduces that controversy about Mosaism with which it is more particularly concerned, and we note that the evil takes the form of leprosy, or uncleanness, a very fitting symbol under the circumstances. This miracle is closely related to Luke xvii. 11–18 of 7 V. In both there is the command to go to the priests. Consideration of series 7 will show that the two miracles have a different meaning; but, as far as the latter is concerned, the man was made whole because he did not go to the priests; and when the man in the earlier miracle was cleansed, it is a legitimate assumption that the charge to show himself to the priests was a test of faith, and not a recognition of the truth of Mosaism on the part of Jesus. The man was a Jew to whom it was shown that the New Gospel was the power to save, and the question was: Would he give up his old religion for the new?

This thought is carried on into stage IV. If the leper went to the priests, he would not have complete faith in Jesus, and the suggestion of this stage is that the Palestinian Church failed in this respect. The miracle introduces teaching about faith which, as far as the Gospel is concerned, has a peculiar meaning, differing in important respects from that generally accepted. It was never intended that reason should be suborned by belief in any historical record.

Jesus is ideological, not material, and faith is an attitude of mind explicable on scientific and psycho-

logical lines. Its practical outcome is the belief in the power of the good, that the will to do can make good things done, and that death itself, the greatest of all evils, is not the end. Faith means living after Jesus' death as if He were still present, and, in the gospel story, its trial does not come till Jesus falls to the power of Satan. As long as He is with His disciples in person, faith cannot be tried, but the writer of the story of the Tempest overcomes the difficulty by representing Jesus as asleep. The disciples show lack of faith, and are not the true followers. The intention of this stage to represent the Palestinians as still clinging to Mosaism is preserved under the picture of these disciples, which is such a contrast to that of the Samaritan leper (xvii. 11–18).

The story of the healing at Gadara comprises two miracles, and offers us another illustration of the fusion in the narrative of two didactic items, but in this case they are following series of the same stage. In this series we are concerned with the story of Legion only, which symbolically presents the relation of the New Gospel to Judaism. The story gives further details of the nature of Satan's bonds. The man was bound with fetters and chains, but broke them and fled. He was hopeless, naked, and a dweller amongst tombs, without religion and the means of a knowledge of God, or, as the narrative puts it, without "house." The legion of devils is the old religions, including Judaism, which have to

be utterly repudiated before any man can be a true follower of Jesus. The man is freed by Jesus, and given the old command: "Let down the net," or be the servant and saviour of humanity.

In stage VI. Jesus is betrayed. It is the first act in the final conflict with the Evil One in whom sin reigned, and who can only be overcome by resurrection. The central idea of Jesus' power still dominates the series, but there is a deeper revelation, for faith now finds a means of expressing its absolute conviction that the Son of God can never be vanquished by evil, however doubtful the circumstances may be.

As a final incident closing this series, we have the demand for the death of Jesus by the Jews in the persistent cry, "Crucify Him, crucify Him, and release unto us Barabbas." But it is somewhat singular, in view of all the teaching concerning the Jews, that Barabbas means "son of the father," which some commentators amplify to mean "son of the Rabbinical Master." The name, then, may point symbolically to the rejection of Jesus by the Jews for their own rabbinical teaching. In any case Barabbas is represented as an imprisoned rebel and murderer, and there is a certain truth to be derived which is quite consistent with the gospel. Jesus, by taking the place of Barabbas, fulfilled His mission of releasing the captives, even the Judaizers, from their bonds.

As a first essential to translating the power of

God manifested in Jesus into human life, it is essential that old religious ideas should be given up. The sheet must be clean before fresh words can be written, and in series 5 we find this idea being worked out through the various stages.

The series opens with a miracle which, in v. 26, is characteristic of stage I. It is of a very different type from the stories of series 4. The didactic level is higher, and the artificiality of the story is even more accentuated. The roofs of the houses in Palestine were flat, of mud and cane, but the author represents it as tiled. It is, however, in the actions of the various sections of the people where contact with reality is lost. The listeners are packed into the house, but the friends of the helpless man manage to get him on to the roof and make a hole large enough for his bed to be let down into the presence of Jesus. No one is hurt or inconvenienced by half a ton of mud, cane, sawn rafters, and beams descending upon their heads. It is only when the man's faith is lauded, and sins are forgiven, that the Pharisees take exception to what is going on.

Sins are rarely referred to in the Gospel, and when they are, they are not to be given their Pauline interpretation of something inherent in humanity, and its inevitable lot. In this case they are to be regarded as an evil similar to palsy. The healing and forgiving are related. When the man was healed, he went into the "house," and there will be no more sin as long as he remains there.

The artificiality of the story clearly indicates a symbolical intention, and it would not be difficult to attach meaning to it in harmony with the rest of the series; but without more knowledge of the whole teaching, and a completer analysis than is here possible, such an attempt would be too speculative to be of any value. We can simply note the anti-Jewish attitude which is adopted.

So far, in considering the revelation of the didactic idea of each series, the order in which the items appear in the gospel narrative is substantially the progressive one; but this is not always the case, and, in 5 II., we have to place the story of the Pharisee and the Publican, which is given later in the narrative. It is no more a parable that many others of the gospel stories, and its parallelism with items of this series is the contrast between the way in which the Pharisee, the type of the Jew, and the Publican, the type of the true follower, approach God. And we learn that the latter, like the palsied, "went down to his 'house' justified rather than the other."

The publicans did justify God, and the Pharisees rejected the baptism of John (vii. 29, 30); but even John, who stands in proto-Luke for the Palestinian Church, is less than the little in the kingdom of God (vii. 28). This is perfectly consistent with stage III. The didactic intention at this point is conveying the idea that Judaism must be repudiated, and that the Palestinians, or those of the baptism of John, are inclining to Mosaism, and are, for that reason,

inferior in status to the Alexandrian Christians, although they are not as yet excluded from the kingdom.

This is continued in stage IV. by a passage which may be incomplete, and in some respects corrupt; but xvi. 15 shows the parallelism of language, while xvi. 16, 17 develops the thought that these Palestinian Christians are those on rocky ground. They received the Word with joy, but are falling away, and approximating to Pharisaism. When John came, the gospel of the kingdom of God was preached. Nevertheless his followers are striving to enter the fold by a way of their own; but it is easier for heaven and earth to pass away than for one tittle of the gospel to fall. They are committing adultery, for they gave up their wives (this is the family symbol so often used), but are now marrying again. They repudiated the old religion, and accepted the New Gospel, but are now re-incorporating old religious ideas.

This definite teaching about Judaism reaches its culmination in stage V., where the devils with which Legion was possessed—his old religious ideas—are embodied in the swine, the unclean beast of the Jews, and choked in the sea. Legion is made whole, but the people—the Judaizers—ask Jesus to depart from them.

Although the polemical purpose, as far as this series 5 is concerned, has been completed by stage V., the symbolical figures of the earlier stages are still

used to complete the series. In stage VI. the question is raised of Jesus' authority, and His reply is both subtle and forceful. When John was received by the Palestinians, it is impossible to question the authority of one who is his master. And we have a hint at the teaching of subsequent series that Mosaism, if properly understood, will lead to Christ. Mosaism is like Satan himself, an evil which can result in good. Satan killed Jesus in order that Jesus, by resurrection, should kill Satan's satellite Death.

As stage VII. puts it, even Moses showed that the dead are raised; but why cling to the old religion when the New Gospel proclaims the true follower as a son of God, the equal of the angels, who neither marry nor are given in marriage, or, adopting the interpretation of stage IV., who give up all other religious ideas, and accept the purity of the New Gospel?

Even from the language used in these seven incidents, it must be admitted that there is so much in common between the various stages as to make the arrangement outside the realm of coincidence; but when we come to consider the realm of ideas, and how the peculiar character of the stages is preserved in a situation of great difficulty, we can only admire the ability of an author who could create such an artifice.

Series 6 may be called the didactic idea of series 5, looked at from the point of view of the true follower.

It is the picture of the Alexandrian who was justified, rather than the Palestinian who was not. Like the earlier series, it is opened with a miracle; in fact, Luke gives three stories all so similar that they must be read side by side and treated as one. And without unnecessary speculation as to their meaning, we can say that they are condemnatory of Judaism, which is withering the activities of those who do not desire its restrictions.

The difference in this stage I. between series 5 and 6 is that the latter series does not mention the forgiveness of sins. Presumably, in series 5, the palsied was a Jew who suffered the disability of being brought up a believer in Judaism in the struggle which all men have to sustain against the Devil. In series 6 the man is a Gentile, whom the Jews would convert to their own way of thinking. The man, however, repudiates Judaism. It is not by such means that release from the bonds of Satan is effected.

Chapter xiii. 16 seems to contradict the conclusion that the central figure is a Gentile. The woman is called a daughter of Abraham. We have, however, to read the expression in the light of Luke iii. 8. Its use in xix. 9 requires the same interpretation: that these children of Abraham were raised up to him, and were not Jews at all.

The setting which persists in the series is that of the feast. In stage I. we find it in xiv. 1. In stage II. it is Levi the Publican who makes the feast.

It is a great one, to which great multitudes are asked, symbolical of the propagation of the gospel, which is the first duty of the true follower. Throughout the Gospel feasting has this meaning, and Levi's feast, like that of the feeding of the thousands, is on a much more liberal scale than any feasts at the "house" of the Pharisees. In this incident the Pharisees murmur against the disciples (the Palestinians), who have not yet shown their leaning to Mosaism, and Jesus replies in language which confirms the interpretation that disease and sin are cognate terms. Jesus alone is the physician. Those who doctor themselves—the Judaizers, who make their own law—have no need of Him.

In stage III. we find the disciples feeding in the cornfields. It is on the Sabbath, and the Judaizers object, because they are acting contrary to the teaching of Moses; but Jesus shows how David broke the law by taking shewbread, and giving to them that were with him. He acted like Levi, and feasted the multitude, implying again that, if the Jews understood Moses, they would be led to Christ.

Stage IV. is very similar, but now we have a clear distinction between the disciples of John and those of Jesus. It is an artifice of the redactor which is necessitated by the stage characteristic. John's disciples are the Palestinian Christians, who are now approximating to the Pharisees. They fast, but the true disciple, the follower of Jesus, feasts like Levi.

In stage V. the Pharisee gives the feast, and the point of the story is transferred to the serving-woman who, like the Publican, is the consistent type of the true follower—the Alexandrian. The symbolism is now of a more direct type. The woman serves Jesus by washing and anointing His feet. There is no need for any extended analysis, for the passage is obviously true both to series and to stage character.

The feasting which has been so persistent is nothing more than setting, and now gives place to the underlying idea of feasting others, or service. There is no code of ethics in the gospel, and all activities are to be guided by the great principle of service to God and fellow-men.

In stage VI. the great service of Jesus in subjecting Himself to Satan is about to be consummated, and He sends two of His disciples to prepare for the Last Supper. To find the "house," they are bidden to follow its good man with the pitcher of water. In this we are anticipating metaphor used in the Didactic Portion, series 10, where the cup is the metaphor of service. A later study will show how important this symbolism is, but, for the moment, it is sufficient to note that the pitcher of water is to be followed.

Finally, in stage VII., the service of Jesus is perfected as Mary and others bring spices and ointment for the body. It is outside the present intention to complicate and extend this review by

referring to Matthew, Mark, and John, but it is not without significance, and evidence of parallelism of teaching, that Matt. xxvi. 12 = Mark xiv. 8; their versions of 6 V. refer to the anointing, while John xii. 3, in addition, calls the woman Mary, who always stands for the true follower.

In series 7 one after another the Gentiles are healed. If the various versions of the three Gospels be examined, and the story of the Syrophœnician woman be added to the few words of stage II., it will be found that for five stages there are peculiarities of language and phrases which are rarely or never met with elsewhere.

As an illustration of how involved the parallelism is, and of how much work remains to be done in analytical studies to prepare the basis for new facts and further discoveries, we can follow through the various versions of the Synoptics.

"Go thy way," and "Go in peace" are used on many occasions.

Matt. viii. 13, stage I., but not Luke.
Luke vii. 50, stage II., Mark vii. 29; but not Matthew.
Luke viii. 48, stage III., Mark v. 34; not in Matthew.
Luke xvii. 19, stage V.

"Faith hath made thee whole," or similar expression.

Matt. viii. 13, and Luke vii. 9, stage I.
Luke vii. 50, stage II.; Matt. xv. 28; not Mark.
Luke viii. 48, stage III.; Matt. ix. 22; Mark v. 34.
Matt. xvii. 20, stage IV.; Mark ix. 24; not Luke.
Luke xvii. 19, stage V.

"Made whole in that hour."

Matt. viii. 13, stage I.; not Luke.
Matt. xv. 28, stage II.; not Luke; but it is interesting to note that Luke of stage I. is parallel with Mark of stage II. (Luke vii. 10 = Mark vii. 30).
Matt. ix. 22, stage III.; not Mark, not Luke.
Matt. xvii. 18, stage IV.; not Mark, not Luke.

"Falling down before Jesus": "Kneeling to Him"—Beseeching Jesus.

Stage I.	Matt. viii. 5.
Stage II., Mark vii. 25	Matt. xv. 22.
Stage III., Luke viii. 47; Mark v. 33	.
Stage IV. Matt. xvii. 14.	Matt. xvii. 15. Luke ix. 38. Mark ix. 22.
Stage V., Luke xvii. 16	Luke xvii. 13.

Frequently the parallelism is not chronological, and one Gospel may follow the language of a different stage in another Gospel. Further points which may be noted are, that the healing in three instances is required for another than the one who makes the request, and in no case are we told that the person was a Jew. The Centurion, the Syrophœnician woman, the man from Cæsarea Philippi, and the Samaritan certainly were not.

As far as the stage characteristics are concerned, and referring only to Luke, stage I. displays its peculiarity in the amazement which the Centurion's faith causes. Stage II. relates the simple story of the woman's service. In stage III. the woman is made whole after spending her living upon physicians (cp. Luke v. 31; 6, II.), the Judaizers who make their own religion. And to illustrate the fact that

the Palestinians were at issue with the Alexandrians, Peter shows his lack of sympathy.

In stage IV. the disciples (the Palestinians) have become more like the Judaizers, and are now the faithless and perverse generation, while in stage V. it is the Samaritan only who is made whole. The nine Jews went to the priest, and did not glorify God.

The revelation grows with stage VI., where Simon the Cyrenian, not the disciple, bears the cross after Jesus. And in stage VII. Mary is rewarded with the knowledge of the Resurrection, and when she tells it to the disciples, "the words appeared in their sight as idle tales, and they disbelieved them."

The symbolism closes in all stages with the idea of the Resurrection, which is meant to teach that Jesus came to conquer evil, the last and greatest representative of which is Death.

The agreement of stages I. and II. with their character so far displayed is obvious, and has already been referred to, while stage III. is fused with the previous series, and follows on much the same lines. The disciples are so far out of sympathy with Jesus' work that they laugh Him to scorn. Jesus has come to the house of the Palestinians (viii. 51), and is showing them that even there the dead can be raised. In other words, it is symbolical of the fact that Moses leads to Christ when understood.

Stage IV. is an obscure passage, which may well

be corrupt, and contain additions to the original. The series idea and stage characteristic are, however, amply illustrated. The former is satisfied by the saying that Jesus is to perish in Jerusalem, but He will be perfected the third day, while xiii. 35 does all that is required for the latter. At the opening of the stage (series 2), we find the disciples receiving Jesus with joy. They shouted "Blessed is the king that cometh in the name of the Lord," meaning the Jewish Messiah (cp. Peter's confession, ix. 20, series 1). Before the end of the Symbolical Portion they are the faithless and perverse generation, for all intents and purposes Judaizers, and Jesus now says "their house is left desolate" till they shall change their belief that Jesus is the Messiah and say, "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord."

In stage V. the idea of resurrection is conveyed in xxii. 69, while the condemnation of the Jews and Judaizers is satisfied by xxii. 68*b*. With stage VI. Jesus gives His spirit into His Father's hands. It is as fitting a subject for the stage of Darkness as the Ascension is for stage VII., the stage of Light.

CHAPTER IX

THE DIDACTIC PORTION

The parallelism of the Didactic Portion is no less pronounced than that experienced in reviewing the Symbolical Portion, but the teaching is on a higher level and more direct. It opens with a double series of illustrations and parables, the first of which, 9*a*, is intimately related to series 5 and 6, while 9*b* acts as a kind of introduction to what follows in the remaining series.

There are now several new metaphors introduced. In the symbolism the publicans and sinners were the followers ; but the introduction, or setting, to the parable of the sheep, stage I. of 9*a*, implies that the sheep also are intended to represent the Christians. We further learn that there are two kinds of sheep : those in the wilderness, and those in the fold. All were originally in the wilderness, and it is only one out of one hundred which is saved by Jesus. Of the ninety-nine, some did not repent, and, in the light of 6 II., they are Judaizers, those by the wayside. Others probably did repent, but, like the Palestinian Christians, they are turning to Judaism. Whether they never believed or lapsed, it is all the same ; they are of the ninety-nine.

The parable of the Lost Piece covers the same ground, but for the moment the significance of the metaphor is doubtful. It will be noted, however, that stage I. summarizes, as it were, the first five stages of series 5 and 6.

In stage II. the teaching appears under the metaphor of the two debtors, but, in the series 6 and 7 context and narrative setting in which they appear, they are clearly the Alexandrian, or true follower, and the Jew; in fact, Gentile and Jew would best fit the meaning of the debtors, for one was in heathen darkness, owing 500 pence, when the other knew God and served Him after a fashion. And because he—the Gentile—was forgiven most, he loved most.

Stage III. now takes up its special point. No man patches up an old garment with a new one. He throws away the old (Mosaism), and wears the new (the gospel). The old wine (Mosaism) is good, but the new is better, and it must be put into fresh skins. If put into the old ones, it will burst them and be spilled.

We now come to that well-known parable misnamed the Prodigal Son. The younger son is the lost sheep, the debtor who owed 500 pence, the Alexandrian who was in heathen darkness in the far country when the elder son was in his Father's "house." He sought God, but could not find Him, and, in his distress, went for help to one of the citizens — the Jews, whom we must remember strayed from the Father's house, but profess to teach

about Him. He found their religion husks that swine did eat, and he lived on them till he came to himself, and realized the indwelling spirit of God in his own heart. This is an epitome of the Alexandrian's experience. He is the lost sheep, and there is great joy when he is found. The elder son can be none other than the Judaizers, the ninety-and-nine sheep, and the debtor owing fifty pence, who is now putting obstacles in the way of the true follower, or causing him to stumble.

In stage V. the metaphor again changes, and the probability is that xviii. 1, the setting to the parable, is corrupt. The point, however, lies in xviii. 7, 8. The Judaizers will be judged for their action, and God will avenge His elect whom they are causing to stumble.

As usual with stages VI. and VII., the teaching takes a broader view. We are now introduced into that family of Bethany with which Jesus was supposed to be so intimate, but they are very different figures here from those of the Gospel of John. Service of Jesus is sitting at His feet like Legion, and bearing the cross after Him like Simon the Cyrenian; it is not being cumbered with ceremony like Martha. It is being "poor," symbolically depicted as the beggar Lazarus, giving up all desire except that for the kingdom which brings eternal life. The conclusion of the series, xvi. 31, amplifies stage III. If these Judaizers had understood Moses and the prophets, they would not have needed any one to bring them to Christ.

The metaphor of poverty will constantly appear in the Didactic Portion. In xxi. 1–4 we have the poor widow. She gave her all, therefore the kingdom of God is hers, and from its simplicity and directness the story has all the elements of stage II. 9*b*.

Stage I. is not unsuitably filled by Luke xiv. 7–14, but it must be confessed that there seems to be an element of literalization about it. To take the lowest seat in order that glory may be gained over others when asked to go higher is hardly the ethics of the gospel. The truer idea is in vers. 12–14. The gospel feast is for the poor, those who have given up all for it, not for the rich.

The metaphor of riches is rendered clearer by subsequent stages. In stage III. the ruler comes to Jesus. He has kept all the law—this is his riches —yet eternal life is not his. The command to sell all does not apply to a particularly rich individual. It concerns everybody, for Jesus said that no one that had riches could enter into the kingdom of God. The ruler has, as xiv. 13 states, to feast the poor, but, like the Palestinian Church, he is very loath to do so. Later in the story Peter, the representative of the Palestinian Church, using the family metaphor, says: "We have given up all for Thee." Jesus does not say that He agrees with Peter, nor does subsequent teaching permit the conclusion that Peter had given up all. Jesus simply says that those who do have eternal life.

What really happened is suggested by stage IV. where riches, or the ceremonialism of Judaism, are represented as accumulating, and the foolish one who is not rich towards God dies. He has been coveting the inheritance of the Jews derived from Moses and the prophets, which Jesus says is not only valueless but a positive harm. A man's life consisteth not in the abundance of such things (xii. 15).

Perhaps the best comment upon this interpretation of riches, and the gospel teaching which underlies it, is seen in stages V. and VI. The Good Samaritan did not sell all that he had. He had an ass and money. Zacchæus, who was rich, had the promise of salvation on saying he had given half his goods to the poor. By a literal acceptance the paradoxical situation is created, that if Christians sell all they cannot feast the poor.

There is much of interest in these stages in the way they anticipate the teaching which is given more explicitly in series 10 and 11, but sufficient has been said to establish the parallelism of the stories, which is the immediate purpose.

The series closes, in stage VII., with the great and only principle in the gospel governing conduct. The Christian life is one of service, and the test of any action is love to God and man.

With series 10 the more definite instruction of the Didactic Portion commences. Little need be said about the fact of parallelism between stages II.,

III., and IV., which has already been sufficiently illustrated by Table A. (p. 15ff.). But stage V. also has features in common with them. Now the disciples take the place of the children, and the Pharisees act like the disciples in stage III. It is not without significance that Matthew's parallel, xxi. 15–17, still preserves the child metaphor, while Luke's reference to the stones, and his part parallel with iii. 8, also hint at a similar underlying idea.

In the same way an inspection of stages I., VI., and VII. offers an undoubted parallelism of idea which brings out the special feature of the series as a whole, and applies the great principle of service announced in 9*b* VII. Jesus came to release the captives from the bonds of Satan. To do this He faces the greatest evil, death. Stage I. is the mystical announcement of this purpose which no one understands. Stage VI. is His acceptance of the cup, the symbol of service, now that His time has come. In stage VII. He hands the cup on to His disciples to divide amongst themselves, symbolical of the service which all must render when following in His steps and bearing the cross after Him.

We can now see how the teaching of service works out in the various stages. Stage I. is the mystical prologue of the series. Stage II. is the definite statement that the gospel must be received by all followers as it is taught by the Alexandrian Church, here represented as the child, the one who takes the

lowly seat at the feast. In stage III. the disciples (the Palestinians) are represented as rebuking the children. They do not receive them, and unless they repent they shall not enter into the kingdom of God. In stage IV. they are still contending, evidently approximating more and more to the Pharisees. At the same time the didactic intention is more explicit, and the idea of service is definitely stated. The polemical intention is completed with stage V. by the practical identification of the Palestinians with the Pharisees.

In the remaining stages VI. and VII. the idea of service is worked out in its wider sense. It is the duty of every man, and it must be like that of Jesus, given to the uttermost. How far Luke xxii. 14–23 is all original is a question, and it is highly probable that the didactic value closes with ver. 18.

It is impossible without an extended study of the other Gospels, and in particular of the polemical intention of Matthew, to do justice to series 11 of proto-Luke, for there are many infiltrations into our Gospel of Luke from Matthew which obscure the issue; but if allowance be made for this, it is not difficult to see the thread of the original teaching, and to experience something of the simplicity and reasonableness which belong to the original.

Stage I. gives us the four Beatitudes which sum up in metaphor much of the subsequent teaching of the series: the possessors of the kingdom are the poor; the hungry shall be filled, the weeping shall

laugh, and the persecuted and hated for Jesus' sake shall be rewarded in heaven. In stage II. we have the poor setting out to fish for men and tell them that the kingdom of God is nigh. Stage III. has been much influenced by Matthew, and it is probable that vers. 32–34 do not completely or correctly represent the Pre-Synoptic Gospel: but there is the same idea of the poor possessing the kingdom behind the symbolism, and the hint at the peculiar character of the stage in the command to the little flock, the Alexandrians, to set their hearts upon the treasure that is always new, that no thief can steal.

In stage IV. we have the Lord's Prayer, parallel in every respect with the Beatitudes. There are four petitions, and it can hardly be coincidence that the first is for the coming of the kingdom: the second is for daily bread, but, like the blessedness of being hungry, we cannot regard the petition from the material and literal point of view. If we do, what are we to make of such sayings as "Be not anxious . . . what ye shall eat" (xii. 22) of the previous stage, and the more definite statement of xii. 29, "Seek not what ye shall eat"?

The third petition runs parallel with the third Beatitude. Sins are the realization of failure—eyes are opened to see the darkness, owing to the satisfaction of hunger—to the entry of the Christ—the Light. This causes weeping, but it is a blessed state because success cannot be attained till knowledge of failure comes. It is a failure in the service

of God, and is forgiven by God as man serves his fellow-men, because that is the only way that man can serve God. Finally, " Bring us not into temptation " interprets the fourth Beatitude. It is not the request to be freed from the fight against evil, but from failing in the fight. To shun the fight is cowardice, and failure, or sin, therefore blessed are those who are persecuted and hated for Jesus' sake, because it is evidence that they are true followers.

Illustrative of the third Beatitude and the third petition, we have stage V. It is the teaching behind the parable of the Good Samaritan. The Jews may persecute, but the Gospel says, Be charitable to them, and so serve God, for " with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you."

The kingdom of God—the Light, the Christ—is within, and all true followers experience this. They are victorious over temptation, and reap the reward of union with Christ and place in heaven (stages VI. and VII.).

Service to God and man is the guiding principle in life, but no one can effectively apply it without faith and willingness to implicitly follow the dictates of the Master of the House. Faith, then, is the first condition of discipleship and preliminary to Baptism. It has to be tested, but its trial is as yet in the future, and the initiate is not left without warning and help in a series of signs.

These signs, which are the subject of series 12, may be called the stimuli of faith. As far as their

parallelism of language and idea is concerned, little need be said. It is self-evident, and will be brought out by a study of stage values.

Of stage I. the probability is that xi. 31 is an infiltration from Matthew, and that the passage is concerned only with the sign of Jonah. This is generally assumed to be some veiled reference to Jesus' death, but in view of the polemical intention of proto-Luke, the explanation seems to lie in the idea which runs through the series and is most definitely expressed by xxi. 33 ; 12, IV.—that the Gospel shall prevail. Jonah disobeyed when he was told to preach to the Gentile city of Nineveh, and was punished. He was again sent, and they were converted, much to his displeasure. The story is the sign to stablish faith, which also suggests that the Gentiles are the true followers, and that the Jews are a stiff-necked and perverse generation and very self-opinionated in matters of religion.

Stage II. is the sign of the weather. As clouds presage rain, and the south wind heat, so shall Christ come in judgment.

In stage III. the sign from nature is the growth of the fig tree. The tree is used as a metaphor for religion analogous to house. At the beginning the Palestinians followed the gospel teaching, *i.e.* they belonged to the true fig. Later, however, they inclined to Mosaism and Judaism, which are symbolized by the sycamine tree, or the false fig. In this stage we have the parable of the fig, which is given one

more year to see if it will become the true or false fig.

In stage IV. we again have the sign of the fig. The coming of leaves and shoots is a sure indication of summer, and the establishment of the kingdom of God is no less certain. This generation cannot prevent it. The implication is that the year has passed, and that the Palestinians are the sycamine tree. Heaven and earth shall pass away before the gospel.

And the days will come when the disciples (the Judaizers) shall desire to see the days of the kingdom of God (stage V.), but they shall be as elusive as the lightning. This generation is destined to reject Jesus.

Stage VI. is influenced by this rejection. Jesus has to be overcome of evil, and the signs are extravagant. There are signs in sun, moon, and stars—distress, perplexity, and fears — even the powers of heaven shall be shaken : But when these things come to pass, lift up your heads, for redemption is nigh, and the Son of Man shall be seen coming with power and great glory.

From stage VII. we gather that proto-Luke was written either when the Roman war was imminent or when it was in its early stages, for the inevitable consequences of such a war are put into prophetic language. The suggestion is that these are the consequences of the Palestinians' own action, and, as stage IV. foretold, they are now desiring to see

one of the days of the Son of Man. Luke xxiii. 31 contains the sign parallel with those other illustrations of the tree, stages III. and IV., which may be interpreted to mean that if these sufferings are the direct result of Christians straying from the original simplicity of the gospel (the green tree), what will happen to the Jews (the dry) who have persisted in their Judaism ?

The tree metaphor is carried on into the next series, 13, dealing with the kingdom of Satan. It still responds to the interpretation of religion given in the last series. As each religion is known by the type of man it produces (vi. 43–45 ; 13, I.), so is each tree known by its fruit. Verses 41 and 42 are later infiltrations from Matthew, and the special point of the series is in vers. 39, 40. There are evil influences in the world, guides who are leading men to disaster. There are Masters of divers sorts, and the character of the disciple depends upon the choice he makes.

In stage II. the two great Masters, Jesus and Satan, are mentioned in a passage which illustrates vi. 40 of stage I. The Seventy who have accepted Jesus return from their mission, saying : " Lord, even the devils are subject unto us in Thy name." Satan is then represented as fallen like lightning from heaven, and the Christians, *i.e.* the perfected as their Master Jesus, are bidden to rejoice that their names are written in heaven.

Stage III. now introduces the usual complica-

tion. In the setting Jesus is confronted with the charge of being in league with Satan in casting out devils, *i.e.* doing the work of the gospel by the aid of Satan. This leads up to a discourse upon the divided "house," but how far xi. 17–23 is original is a matter requiring longer analysis and examination than is here possible. From ver. 21 onwards, at any rate, we have the two Masters, presumably Jesus and Satan; but the subjection of Satan is not the simple matter of stage II., and the teaching goes on in ver. 23 ff. to tell us that there are some even amongst the Christians who, after accepting Jesus, have lost their whole-hearted enthusiasm. They are negative rather than positive opponents of Jesus, but it makes no difference. "He that is not with Me is against Me," says Jesus, and, as if to particularize the Palestinians, he illustrates the point. The devil has been cast out of the house, but they have not permitted Christ to fill it. It is empty, and Satan comes again with sevenfold strength, "and the last state of that man is worse than the first."

Stage IV. (xii. 57–59) represents the Palestinian on the way to the Judge with the adversary Satan. It is another picture, like that of stage III., but whereas xi. 24–26 are in the nature of a warning as to what will happen when any one is not for Jesus, stage IV. shows us the Palestinians disregarding the warning, and being appealed to to quit Satan before it is too late.

Stage V. carries the same thought one step

further. The appeal is not heeded, and, in xix. 45, 46, Jesus is represented as entering the Temple, the symbol of the Jewish religion, and saying that they have made God's house a den of robbers. Satan is now obviously the Master, and, consistently, not only with the polemical purpose but also with the stage, he is represented as Judaism.

In stage VI. (xxii. 47, 48) Judas, into whom Satan has entered (4, VI.), betrays the Son of Man with a kiss; while in stage VII. Jesus makes supplication for Simon, whom Satan has asked for—meaning, presumably, that the Palestinians will be saved.

The didactic idea of Satan and his kingdom is characteristically expressed by both these stages, but stage VII. as it stands introduces a serious anachronism. It is given a later stage teaching than xxii. 54–62. There are, however, indications that vers. 33, 34 are of late incorporation. Jesus has just made supplication that Peter's faith fail not, and has told him to stablish his brethren, when he has turned again. In ver. 35 ff. we see the turning again of Peter. He and the other Palestinians were "poor" when they set out, but they did not remain so. They added Jewish ceremony to the Gospel. They treated Judaism as the source, and Christianity as a reformation of it. Now they repent, and Jesus tells them to sell this cloak and buy a sword. It is an expression typical of the difference between Christianity and Judaism. Christianity is a fight with Satan. Judaism is a cloaking of transgression

—expiating sins by vicarious sacrifice. And illustrative of how Peter has grown in the direction of repentance, he is prepared with two swords.

The excision of xxii. 33, 34 will carry with it the fulfilment of the prophecy in xxii. 60, and the removal of the corrupt passages will add much to the clarity of the Gospel. If xxii. 34 were genuine, Peter could not help denying Jesus. If he did not, Jesus would be a false prophet.

Following the teaching about the kingdom of Satan we have that of the kingdom of God, with its necessary corollary of the means by which God is apprehended. There are two main ideas: What the kingdom of God is, and how the initiate is led to understand it.

Stage I. opens with the so-called explanation of the Sower parable. This has already been considered in series 2, to which the parable itself belongs, and need not be amplified here; but viii. 9, 10 afford us an explanation of the dual series value 2 and 14 which it can have in Table D. There are two classes of catechumen: those within, and those without. For those without, Symbolism, or series 1–8, is the form of teaching. Those within are promoted to series 9–16.

Stage I. gives us in allegorical form the four kinds of people with which the Gospel is concerned, and the parable must be coupled with xi. 33–36, which contain the original member of the doublet Luke viii. 16 = xi. 33 and an extension of it. The teaching

is wrapped up in metaphor, which subsequent stages will make clearer; but even from inspection it is not unreasonable to give "light" a meaning analogous to Master, *i.e.* a man's religious belief. The Master must be confessed. Others must see the light. And as light comes through the eye, it must be of such a character that the religion of Jesus enters. If so, the body is full of light; if not, it is full of darkness. And ver. 35 is the warning to all that the light be not darkness.

After this highly mystical passage we have the simple teaching of stage II. (Luke x. 21–24), appearing as a prayer of Jesus, and a short talk to the disciples before they assume in stage III. the fickle character of those on the rocky ground. Its substance is parallel with stage I. God hides "these things"—the mysteries of the gospel—from the wise and understanding—those who are whole and need no physician—and reveals them to the babes, the children, the Alexandrians, and "Blessed are the eyes which see the 'things' which ye see" (x. 24).

Stage III. continues with a similar but more direct use of terms: "Blessed are they which hear the Word of God and keep it" (xi. 28). The metaphor of eye and light is dropped, and the implication is that there are some who do not keep the gospel—the Word of God. The same idea creeps into the description of the kingdom of God. For the tree to grow to perfection, and be of service to

others, so that they lodge in its branches, the seed must be sown in a man's *own* garden. It must not be planted in that of the Jews, nor can the gospel be debtor to any religion.

Stage IV. develops the idea on its usual lines. So far in our outline of the gospel teaching there has been no attempt to define what the kingdom of God is, but it has often been referred to, and has assumed the form of a state of being here and now which the gospel produces. We now find it likened to leaven in meal, and that which produces the best bread. Coupled with it there is the warning, "Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees," followed by a saying which reverts to the metaphors of light and darkness used in stage I.

In the anti-Jewish stage V. the mystery of the gospel is stated. Jesus has to die, and the Jews are the instruments of His death. It is the unfolding of "these things" mentioned in stage II. which are hidden from the wise and revealed to babes, and it is the disciples—the Judaizers (xviii. 34)—from whom they are hidden. The Palestinians did not heed the warning of stage IV.

Immediately following we have the opening of the eyes of the blind man by the wayside, and in view of the facts that the Jews are those by the wayside in the Sower parable, and that the man cried out the belief of the Jews that Jesus is the son of David and the Messiah which shall redeem Israel, the only possible interpretation of the symbolism

is that the kingdom of God is still open for the Jews if they will repent. They have only to be "poor" (the man is a beggar, and presumably complies with this condition) to obtain the release which Jesus promises from the bonds of Satan. The significant point is that "they that went before rebuked Him." The Palestinian leaders against whom the Polemic is written are still obdurate, although some of their followers may not be.

With the remaining stages we have the more universal teaching. "These things" are being accomplished. With stage VI. the light is obscured: "This is your hour and the power of darkness." But with stage VII. "He opened their minds that they might understand the scriptures."

The narrative in which stage VII. teaching is enshrined is a long one, but it can be all interpreted by the polemical intention of proto-Luke. There are two stories of appearances of Jesus after His resurrection. In the first, two men are journeying to Emmaus discussing "these things" when Jesus joins them without revealing His personality. They state their case, which is substantially that of the Palestinian Christians in representing Jesus as the Jewish Messiah. Jesus expounds "these things," and, after breaking bread, He vanishes.

The second story is concerned with the disciples to whom the two returned with the story of Jesus' resurrection. Again, Jesus appears, but they are terrified and affrighted until He eats before them.

And again He explains the law and the prophets, and opens their minds that they might understand.

One important feature of the two stories is the confirmation we get of the interpretation given to the miracle of stage V.: that the Palestinian leaders were more obdurate than some of their followers.

All that is now required to complete the teaching of the gospel is to analyze the motive of those who profess to believe in it (series 15), and to weigh in the balance the individual's worth (series 16).

Stage I. of series 15 (Luke xiv. 25–35) sets out in a general way the necessary attitude of the disciple towards the Christian life. As a preliminary the old religious ideas (under the symbol of the family metaphor) must be repudiated, and the cross, the emblem of service, must be borne after Jesus. Two short parables follow, to illustrate the necessity of right motive and intention. The cost of being a disciple, and all that it entails, must be fully considered before the first step is taken, for it is better not to start on the way than to fail. Faith in the power of Jesus must be absolute or victory is impossible. Verse 33 sums up the essential attitude in a few words, which are another rendering of the first Beatitude. Every other desire but that for the kingdom must be renounced. Salt which has lost its savour is fit for nothing, and the passage closes with the mystical saying on hearing which is so characteristic of stage I.

Stage II. deals with the problem of secular life.

"Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's," and it is difficult to conceive of such teaching emanating from a Palestinian source. It is the command to respect the laws and government of the Romans in so far as they do not contradict the expressed teaching of the gospel.

After this it is strange reading in stage III. to have a prophetic remark about the persecutions which the civil government will inflict. But we can note that it is the parents, brethren, and kinsfolk who are to be responsible for this—again the family metaphor—and this persecution is the same as that which culminates in the crucifixion of Jesus (stage VI.), pointing, on the one hand, to Jewish propaganda against the gospel, and on the other to the mystery teaching that the cross must be borne after Jesus, that the path of life must be in His footsteps, that Christ is the Master of the House, and His voice the guiding principle.

The parallelism of teaching between stages III. and IV. is clearly indicated by the doublet xxi. 12–15 = xii. 11, 12. The verses of stage IV. have filtered through from stage III. because the teaching is parallel, and there has been some slight confusion of didactic values. In language, xii. 4–7, too, are closely parallel with stage III.

The special stage IV. teaching lies in xii. 8–10. The Christian is warned. He must confess Jesus, and not deny, or he will be denied by Jesus Himself.

But there are some who are in danger of sinning unforgivably. This last saying is obscure, but a careful analysis of the Gospels suggests that blasphemers against the Holy Spirit are hypocrites. They are pretending Christianity with ulterior motive, desiring to learn the mysteries without any intention of following the teaching; and it can well be a warning directed against the wilful leaders of the Palestinian Church.

This warning seems to have been heeded by the bulk of the Palestinians, for, in stage V., we have the denial of Peter and his repentance. As far as this story is concerned, the introduction of the cock-crows is superfluous, for a more potent reason for repentance is the look which the Lord turned on Peter.

With stage VI. we have the picture of the two malefactors and Jesus, which occurs in a setting so congenial to the stage. Jesus is in the hands of the power of darkness. It seems almost superfluous to detail the points of parallelism with other stages. The idea of taking up the cross and following Jesus, of giving up all of stage I., the persecution and even death of the follower of stage III. parallel with that of Jesus the prototype, the confession of Jesus of stage IV., the denials of stages IV. and V., have already been cited, and all find their echo in stage VI.

Although this passage is in no sense peculiar, it illustrates very forcibly the importance of Luke as

the truest approximation to the original. We only need to compare Matthew and Mark's versions of the incident to realize that the didactic idea is lost in these Gospels by a process of literalization which reduces the Gospel from a didactic instrument of religious worth to a series of not very credible stories, many of which have not the slightest religious value.

The series closes in xxiv. 46–49 with the repetition of the central mystery of Jesus' death, in order to rise again. And the followers of Jesus are the witnesses of "these things" which are to be published unto all nations.

Series 16, the judgment of mankind, is a fitting close to the Gospel. It is not a judgment of morals or from any ethical standpoint. It is purely religious, and an estimate of how the initiate has followed in the footsteps of Jesus, the revealer of the Alexandrian mysteries.

Throughout the Gospel we have had many references to the "house," and practically without exception the word has been given the symbolical meaning of religion—not necessarily Christianity, for not infrequently the Pharisee's house is referred to, but, when unqualified, it is the religion of Jesus. The Master of the house is Christ, who is within all true followers. He is analogous to the voice of an enlightened conscience which, when followed, guides the lives of men. It is perfectly natural, then, in this series, estimating the worth of what might be termed

the house that a man builds, that the words "house," and "Master of the house," should figure very largely.

Stage I. is given in two detached portions—in Luke xvii. 26–37 plus xxi. 34–36. The reason for this detachment need not concern us here; it will be sufficient to note that the parallelism of idea appears as one consecutive narrative in Matt. xxiv. 36–44.

In the earlier chapter we have references to the days of Noah and Lot to illustrate how unexpected the judgment of the Son of Man will be. There can be little doubt that housetop, and house, and many other metaphors found in xvii. 31–37 had some definite purpose when originally used; but there are evidences of corruption in the text both of this and xxi. 34–36—also depicting a judgment scene —which make exegesis too speculative for the moment. There is no doubt that the passage, as a whole, belongs to series 16, and is most fittingly of stage I.

Stage II. needs little comment. The man who hears the Word and does it has his house founded upon a rock; he that heareth and doeth not builds his house upon the earth. And we can note that in this instance the gospel is only concerned with those who have had the opportunity of learning Christianity.

In stage III. we have what is called the parable of the Dishonest Steward. He is in charge of his

lord's house, but he has wasted the goods, and has to give an account of his stewardship. To provide for the consequences of his inevitable discharge, he curries favour with his lord's debtors, so that he may be received into their house. So far, this exactly expresses the course which the Palestinian Church has taken in incorporating Jewish practices into their Christianity. The difficulty of the story is in vers. 8 and 9. Unless they are a satirical comment, the only conclusion is that they are later infiltration. And when we find in ver. 9, which is parallel in many respects with ver. 4, that the literalization "eternal tabernacles" is used instead of "houses," there is some support for adopting the alternative of later incorporation.

The parable then goes on to comment upon the steward's action. He (the Palestinian) is trying to serve two Masters. He pretends to be a Christian, but at the same time adopts Mosaism. He is faithful to neither, and we have a true stage III. representation of the teaching of the judgment series.

We have found in examining stage IV. of the Didactic Portion that it usually takes the form of a warning of the Palestinian Church. This judgment scene is no exception. The allegory now represents the kingdom of God as a supper, to which many (obviously the Jews) are bidden. One and all make excuses, and when the Lord—the Master of the house—is informed, he bids the poor, the maimed, those from the by-ways and hedges (the Alexan-

drians), to fill the house. The warning is then issued: "None of those men which were bidden shall taste of my supper."

The anti-Jewish character of the stage V. incident, and its parallelism with the rest of the series, are beyond question. The Master of the house is now represented as the judge. He has shut the door, but there are some without who have heard the Word (the Gospel does not concern itself with the heathen, who have had no chance of Christian knowledge), and who have been Christians, for they have eaten in Jesus' presence, and taught in the streets. These are the Palestinians who have disregarded the warning of stage IV. They have not accepted the Alexandrian Gospel and renounced Mosaism, therefore they have denied Jesus, and He will deny them. They shall be cast out like the savourless salt, and the Gentiles shall sit down in their place, the last first, and the first last.

This re-arrangement of the Gospel of Luke is not proto-Luke, still less is it the Pre-Synoptic Gospel, but it is clear from the way in which a consistent teaching emerges when the re-arranged Luke is studied that it approximates much more closely to the Pre-Synoptic Gospel than we have a right to expect. Perhaps this series has suffered to a larger extent than the others. Corruption has already been suggested as the explanation of some features in stages I. and III., and the same must be said

of stage VI., for a comparison of Matthew and Luke's version (Matt. xxv. 14–30 = Luke xix. 11–27) offers a good illustration of what must have taken place.

The parables of the Talents and the Pounds have so much in common that they must have had the same source, and ought to be identical in teaching; but, on inspection, we find that there are such minor divergencies as to radically change the didactic idea. In Matthew there are three servants, to each of whom is given a sum of money proportionate to his abilities, and the one who made no money is cast out. In Luke there are ten servants, each of whom receives a pound. The unprofitable servant is censured, but he is not cast out. It is the citizens of that country who are slain. We also want to know what becomes of the remaining seven servants to whom pounds were given. It is obvious that any exegesis is speculative, and, unless supported by very detailed and careful investigation, it is not worth putting forward. Such investigation should extend to Luke xii. 41–48 = Matt. xxiv. 43–51, which profess to explain one of these judgment parables.

The Gospel closes with the parable of the Wicked Husbandmen (Luke xx. 9–19), and there could be no more fitting conclusion to the judgment of a man's religious worth, and of the house which he has built. Jesus is the great corner-stone of the building, and some are preferring to build without it: "Every

one that falleth on that stone shall be broken, and on whomsoever it shall fall it shall scatter as dust." The setting in which this final judgment appears is the rejection of the messengers of God by the Jews throughout their history.

CHAPTER X

THE NEW POINT OF VIEW

The method of examining the Gospel, as illustrated above, by its usefulness, has afforded proof of its truth. Parallelism and the pre-synoptic order are no figment of the imagination. They are founded on a principle which works when applied. Every verse has its meaning, and responds to the same method. The Gospel is far more wonderful than our glimpses of pieces here and there can convey. It is worn and patched, but very little considering the extraordinary use to which it has been put; and we must accept the new point of view in place of the old, with all that it entails, and whatever the apparent consequences, because it is truer, otherwise we are denying Christ, who said: "He that denieth Me in the presence of men shall be denied in the presence of the angels of God."

That the New Solution should turn upside down all the old ideas about the Gospel is only to be expected when we consider the different point of view that has to be taken, and that our Synoptic Gospels are a devolution and corruption, rather than an evolution and growth. But it is not turning upside down anything that is of importance to the Christian

religion. The old ideas have served their purpose, and are of themselves falling into ruin. From within the Church have come the seeds of decay. And, astonishing as it may seem, first one miracle is given up, then another. Psycho-therapeutics is called in to explain these extraordinary stories, and, as that fails to account for the Virgin Birth and the Resurrection, they are frankly given up.

Enlightened Christian teachers are finding the Gospels less and less historical. Of the Fourth Gospel Dr. Burkitt writes : " If the history turn out to be no history, it must be because it was intended to teach something to the author more important than History " (*Gospel History and its Transmission*, p. 218). And he finds, in fact, that the history is no history. Even of the " historical Mark " he writes : " It is impossible not to regard Mark viii. 11–21 as derived from genuine historical reminiscences. Yet the same passage shows us that the apostles had not been influenced by the eating of the two meals, a circumstance which would be indeed incredible if the events had come to pass in the way generally supposed. What actually happened is of course quite beyond our power to ascertain " (p. 73).

There is little, if any, difference between such a conclusion and a frank admission that the feeding of the thousands was symbolical, nor is it much further to say that Luke's history is no history. Again, in writing of his map on the wanderings of

Jesus in Palestine, he says: "If it be no true itinerary it is well that we should clearly realize what kind of a route our document puts before us" (Preface to third edition, p. xiii.). What credibility can be granted to history which does not find in its place a counterpart for its time?

Liberal thought regards Jesus as no more than a man whose uniqueness alone separates Him from the rest of mankind; but even this quality is becoming elusive. Of course all these conclusions are inevitable from a scientific application of the laws of historical criticism; but they leave religion in the air without foundation. 1 Corinthians xv. 14 contains one of the essential truths of religion: no Resurrection no Gospel. The fact of Christianity is not accounted for by modern conceptions of Jesus, and for that reason alone its "history can not be history."

It is perhaps hardly realized that the symbolical estimate of Christianity held a very important place in the Early Church. Unhappily, we are only permitted to view it through chinks in the great wall of time into which fragments of coloured and imperfect glass have been let. Dr. Burkitt calls Marcion Christianity without history. We know little of him, but the Marcionites were a power for many centuries, and, judging from the quotations and arguments of their critics, we find that our conclusions are nothing new. They are merely a revival of thoughts that were not able to survive in their intellectual environment.

How far back these thoughts had their origin it is impossible to say. They are credited to Marcion, who was born about A.D. 100, but they may well have been older than the dates which figure in the history. They may be the main stem of the tree of religion cut down early in its growth. It is now far out-topped by the twigs of the branches, and it is on these twigs that "liberal thought" lies. But Jesus, the man, no matter how unique, cannot be the Son of God to whom all things were delivered of the Father. A thousand books may be written, but they can never remove the paradox of His divinity and humanity or establish the sinlessness of the man Jesus. The branches need grafting on to the old mutilated stem. It is only thus that liberal thought can find expression without self-contradiction.

The silence of other New Testament writings about the miracles and sayings which ought to be so vastly more than those of the Synoptists' records need cause no surprise. The hundreds of miracles were never wrought, and the thousands of sayings which the historical origin requires were never uttered. Instead, we have the sublimest religious idealism that the mind of man has yet conceived. It is as true to-day as it was nineteen hundred years ago. It is founded upon the rock, for it is the experience of humanity. Christ had no objective and material personality. He is the Son of God. No man can deny that the principle of the good

and right exists; but its only house is humanity. And when a man makes that principle the master of his house, he has Christ within. He gives up all for the kingdom of God, and leads that life which the Master dictates.

A man cannot have faith in a miracle which his intelligence tells him is not true; but he can have faith in the victory of the Good, and such faith has its justification because it helps to make the Good victorious.

The Gospel lies buried deeply underneath layer after layer of re-interpretation, explanation, and misunderstanding, all of which have been leading further and further away from it. It is like an ancient stuccoed wall. We think its whitened surface is its substance, and worship as at a shrine. When lo! a fresco shows beneath the peeling plaster, and we find figures and scenes immuned. But as the plaster is to the painting, so is the painting to the greater and more abiding verities, the thoughts and ideals of which the pictures are no more than symbols.

Such thoughts and ideals have to be. It is part of the method of the Universe, which all nature proclaims. There is a heaven beyond, because progress and development have been, are, and will be. No man knows the whither of the onward march. That is bound up with the very essence of faith, but the way is for the will of man to create his Christ in the light of the experience of

the race, and to strive earnestly and solely to follow Him.

Nineteen hundred years ago the master minds of Christianity felt the urge of these ideals, and they found light enough to visualize these truths. Perhaps it was because they realized their blindness that they saw, for there is truth in that paradox. If, during nineteen centuries, man had willed to see Christ, and had forgotten his creeds and dogmas, it cannot be denied that the Christ would have become a power such as has never been felt in the Universe before.

Item.	Column 1.—MATTHEW.	Column 2.—MARK.	Column 3. LUKE	Column 4.—LUKE.
1.	**XVII. 14–19**: Healing the son of the man from Cæsarea Philippi. **20**: Illustration of the Mustard Seed. Column 4	**IX. 14 27**: Healing the son of the man from Cæsarea Philippi. **28 29**: Discourse in the "House."	**IX. 37 43**: Healing the son of the man from Cæsarea Philippi.	**XVII. 5–10**: Illustration of the Mustard Seed. Column 1 **11–19**: Healing the Samaritan Leper.
2.	**22** And while they abode in Galilee, Jesus said unto them, The Son of man shall be delivered up into the hands of men; **23** and they shall kill him, and the third day he shall be raised up. And they were exceeding sorry. } Item 10	**30** And they went forth from thence, and passed through Galilee: and he would not that any man should know it. **31** For he taught his disciples, and said unto them, The Son of man is delivered up into the hands of men, and they shall kill him; and when he is killed, after three days he shall rise again. **32** But they understood not the saying, and were afraid to ask him. } Item 10	But while all were marvelling at all the things which he did, he said unto his disciples, **44** Let these words sink into your ears: for the Son of man shall be delivered up into the hands of men. **45** But they understood not this saying, and it was concealed from them, that they should not perceive it: and they were afraid to ask him about this saying. } Item 10 } Item 10, Col. 4	**20** And being asked by the Pharisees, when the kingdom of God cometh, he answered them and said, The kingdom of God cometh not with observation: **21** neither shall they say, Lo, here! or, There! for lo, the kingdom of God is within you. } Item 8; Luke xviii. 24 ff. **22** And he said unto the disciples, The days will come, when ye shall desire to see one of the days of the Son of man, and ye shall not see it. } Item 10, Column 4 **25** But first must he suffer many things and be rejected of this generation } Item 10 **26–37**: Eschatological Discourse.
3.	**24** And when they were come to Capernaum, they that received the half-shekel came to Peter. **25–27**: Story of Tribute Money.	**33** And they came to Capernaum:		
4.	**XVIII. 1** In that hour came the disciples unto Jesus, saying, Who then is greatest in the kingdom of heaven? **2** And he called to him a little child, and set him in the midst of them, **3** and said, Verily I say unto you, Except ye turn, and become as little children, ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven. **4** Whosoever therefore shall humble himself as this little child, the same is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven. **5** And whoso shall receive one such little child in my name receiveth me. } *g* } *c* } *b*	and when he was in the house he asked them, What were ye reasoning in the way? **34** But they held their peace: for they had disputed one with another in the way, who *was* the greatest. **35** And he sat down, and called the twelve; and he saith unto them, If any man would be first, he shall be last of all, and minister of all. **36** And he took a little child, and set him in the midst of them: and taking him in his arms, he said unto them, **37** Whosoever shall receive one of such little children in my name, receiveth me: and whosoever receiveth me, receiveth not me, but him that sent me. } *d* } *e* } *a*	**46** And there arose a reasoning among them, which of them should be greatest. **47** But when Jesus saw the reasoning of their heart, he took a little child, and set him by his side, **48** and said unto them, Whosoever shall receive this little child in my name receiveth me; and whosoever shall receive me receiveth him that sent me: for he that is least among you all, the same is great. } *c* } *f*	
5.				**XVIII. 1**: Praying, not fainting. **2–8**: Story of the Importunate Woman, with its application. } Item 11
6.	**XVIII. 6** to **XIX. 12**: Parables and sayings of an Anti-Jewish character.	**IX. 30** to **X. 12**: Parables and sayings of an Anti-Jewish character.	**IX. 49** to **X. 20**: Anti-Jewish and general sayings.	**9–14**: Anti-Jewish parable.
7.	**13** Then were there brought unto him little children, that he should lay his hands on them, and pray: and the disciples rebuked them. **14** But Jesus said, Suffer the little children, and forbid them not, to come unto me: for of such is the kingdom of heaven. **15** And he laid his hands on them, and departed thence.	**13** And they brought unto him little children, that he should touch them: and the disciples rebuked them. **14** But when Jesus saw it, he was moved with indignation, and said unto them, Suffer the little children to come unto me; forbid them not: for of such is the kingdom of God. **15** Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall in no wise enter therein. **16** And he took them in his arms, and blessed them, laying his hands upon them. } *d, e* } *c* } *b* } *a*	**21** In that same hour he rejoiced in the Holy Spirit, and said, I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou didst hide these things from the wise and understanding, and didst reveal them unto babes: **23** And turning to the disciples, he said privately, Blessed *are* the eyes which see the things that ye see: **24** for I say unto you, that many prophets and kings desired to see the things which ye see, and saw them not; and to hear the things which ye hear, and heard them not.	**15** And they brought unto him also their babes, that he should touch them: but when the disciples saw it, they rebuked them. **16** But Jesus called them unto him, saying, Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not: for of such is the kingdom of God. **17** Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall in no wise enter therein.
8.	**16** And behold, one came to him and said, Master, what good thing shall I do, that I may have eternal life? **17** And he said unto him, Why askest thou me concerning that which is good? One there is who is good: but if thou wouldest enter into life, keep the commandments. **18** He saith unto him, Which? And Jesus said, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, **19** Honour thy father and thy mother: and, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. } Column 3 **23** And Jesus said unto his disciples, Verily I say unto you, It is hard for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of heaven. **24–30**: Conclusion of the Discourse.	**17** And as he was going forth into the way, there ran one to him, and kneeled to him, and asked him, Good Master, what shall I do that I may inherit eternal life? **18** And Jesus said unto him, Why callest thou me good? none is good save one, *even* God. **19** Thou knowest the commandments, Do not kill, Do not commit adultery, Do not steal, Do not bear false witness, Do not defraud, Honour thy father and mother. **20** And he said unto him, Master, all these things have I observed from my youth. **23** And Jesus looked round about, and saith unto his disciples, How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God! **24–31**: Conclusion of the Discourse.	**25** And behold, a certain lawyer stood up and tempted him, saying, Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life? **26** And he said unto him, What is written in the law? how readest thou? **27** And he answering said, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbour as thyself. } Column 1 **28** And he said unto him, Thou hast answered right: this do, and thou shalt live.	**18** And a certain ruler asked him, saying, Good Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life? **19** And Jesus said unto him, Why callest thou me good? none is good, save one, *even* God. **20** Thou knowest the commandments, Do not commit adultery, Do not kill, Do not steal, Do not bear false witness, Honour thy father and mother. **21** And he said, All these things have I observed from my youth up. **24** And Jesus seeing him said, How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God! } Item 2; Luke xvii. 24 **25–30**: Conclusion of the Discourse.
9.	**XX. 1–16**: Parable of Labourer in Vineyard.		**29–42**: Stories of Good Samaritan and Martha and Mary.	
10.	**17** And as Jesus was going up to Jerusalem, he took the twelve disciples apart, and in the way he said unto them, **18** Behold, we go up to Jerusalem; and the Son of man shall be delivered unto the chief priests and scribes; and they shall condemn him to death, **19** and shall deliver him unto the Gentiles to mock, and to scourge, and to crucify: and the third day he shall be raised up. } Item 2	**32** And they were in the way, going up to Jerusalem; and Jesus was going before them: and they were amazed; and they that followed were afraid. And he took again the twelve, and began to tell them the things that were to happen unto him, **33** *saying*, Behold, we go up to Jerusalem; and the Son of man shall be delivered unto the chief priests and the scribes; and they shall condemn him to death, and shall deliver him unto the Gentiles: **34** and they shall mock him, and shall spit upon him, and shall scourge him, and shall kill him; and after three days he shall rise again. } Item 2		**31** And he took unto him the twelve, and said unto them, Behold, we go up to Jerusalem, and all the things that are written by the prophets shall be accomplished unto the Son of man. **32** For he shall be delivered up unto the Gentiles, and shall be mocked, and shamefully entreated, and spit upon: **33** and they shall scourge and kill him: and the third day he shall rise again. **34** And they understood none of these things: and this saying was hid from them, and they perceived not the things that were said. } Item 2 } Item 2, Columns 3 and 4
11.			**XI. 1–4**: The Lord's Prayer. **5–13**: Story of the Importunate Man, and its application. } Item 5	
12.	**20** Then came to him the mother of the sons of Zebedee with her sons, worshipping *him*, and asking a certain thing of him. **21** And he said unto her, What wouldest thou? She saith unto him, Command that these my two sons may sit, one on thy right hand, and one on thy left hand, in thy kingdom. **24** And when the ten heard it, they were moved with indignation concerning the two brethren. **25** But Jesus called them unto him, and said, Ye know that the rulers of the Gentiles lord it over them, and their great ones exercise authority over them. **26** Not so shall it be among you: but whosoever would become great among you shall be your minister; **27** and whosoever would be first among you shall be your servant: **28** even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.	**35** And there come near unto him James and John, the sons of Zebedee, saying unto him, Master, we would that thou shouldest do for us whatsoever we shall ask of thee. **36** And he said unto them, What would ye that I should do for you? **37** And they said unto him, Grant unto us that we may sit, one on thy right hand, and one on *thy* left hand, in thy glory. **41** And when the ten heard it, they began to be moved with indignation concerning James and John. **42** And Jesus called them to him, and saith unto them, Ye know that they which are accounted to rule over the Gentiles lord it over them; and their great ones exercise authority over them. **43** But it is not so among you: but whosoever would become great among you, shall be your minister: **44** and whosoever would be first among you, shall be servant of all. **45** For verily the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many. } *g* } *e* } *f*		
13.	**29** And as they went out from Jericho, a great multitude followed him. **30** And behold, two blind men sitting by the way side, when they heard that Jesus was passing by, cried out, saying, Lord, have mercy on us, thou son of David.	**46** And they come to Jericho: and as he went out from Jericho, with his disciples and a great multitude, the son of Timæus, Bartimæus, a blind beggar, was sitting by the way side. **47** And when he heard that it was Jesus of Nazareth, he began to cry out, and say, Jesus, thou son of David, have mercy on me.	**14.** And he was casting out a devil *which was* dumb. And it came to pass, when the devil was gone out, the dumb man spake. Chronological parallel of Matt. xii. **22.** Then was brought unto him one possessed with a devil, blind and dumb; and he healed him, insomuch that the dumb man spake and saw. **23** And all the multitudes were amazed, and said, Is this the son of David?	**35** And it came to pass, as he drew nigh unto Jericho, a certain blind man sat by the way side begging: **36** and hearing a multitude going by, he inquired what this meant. **37** And they told him, that Jesus of Nazareth passeth by. **38** And he cried, saying, Jesus, thou son of David, have mercy on me.

APPENDIX C. TABLE C.

Didactic Value or Series.	Didactic Idea.	First Narrative Parallel	Second Narrative Parallel.	Third Narrative Parallel.	Fourth Narrative Parallel.
	SYMBOLICAL PORTION.				
7	The faith of the Gentiles: IX. 37–43*a*.				
8	Victory over death.				
	DIDACTIC PORTION.				
9	Illustrations of the faithful and of the faithless	..	X. 25–42	XII. 13–21	..
10	The essentiality of service	IX. 43*b*–48	..	..	..
	Symbolical intrusion	(49–62)	..	..	..
11	The principles of life's action	X. 1–7	XI. 1–13	22–34	..
	Infiltration from Matthew	(8–16)	..	..	..
	Passage of doubtful originality	..	(14, 15)	..	..
12	The signs of the coming	..	16, 29–32	..	XII. 54–56
13	The kingdom of Satan	17–20	17–26	..	57–59
	Passage of doubtful originality	..	..	..	(XIII. 1–17)
14	The kingdom of God	21–24	27, 28, 33–36	..	18–21
	Infiltration from Matthew	..	(37–54) XII. 1–3	..	..
15	The motive of the follower	..	4–12	..	..
16	The Judgment	..	..	35–53	22–30

APPENDIX D. TABLE D.

THE NARRATIVE PARALLELS OF THE GOSPEL OF LUKE

A.	B.	Subject.	C.	D.
		SYMBOLICAL PORTION.		
		First Narrative Parallel.		
III. 21, 22	1, I.	Baptism of Jesus.		
		Jesus began to teach . . .	III. 23*a*	2
		Genealogy from Adam, the Universal Father	23*b*–38	..
IV. 1–13	..	Temptation—Gospel Prologue—opening Stage II., which is the beginning of actual instruction.		
		Teaching in synagogue . .	IV. 14, 15	2
16–22*a*	2, I.	Preaching at Nazareth.		
22*b*–30	2, V.	No prophet accepted in his own country.		
		Is not this Joseph's son ? . .	22*b*	1
		The widow of Sidon and Naaman the Syrian, both of them Gentiles, and used for the type of those who follow Jesus . . .	25–27	3
		The power of Jesus . . .	28–30	4
31–37	4, I.	Demoniac healed.		
		His word was with authority .	31, 32	2
38, 39	4, II.	Simon's mother-in-law healed.		
		Healing generally. Other cities also } Framework carrying on the idea to N.P. 2	40, 41	4
			42, 43	7
		Second Narrative Parallel.		
		Preaching in the synagogues of Galilee	44	2
V. 1–11	3, I.	Miraculous draught of fishes : Simon and others follow Jesus.		
		The multitude taught the Word of God	V. 1–3	2

TABLE D—NARRATIVE PARALLELS OF LUKE'S GOSPEL

A.	B.	Subject.	C.	D.
V. 12–15	4, III.	Healing the leper.		
16–26	5, I.	Healing the palsied.		
		Praying in the desert . . .	16	1
		Teaching	17	2
		Pharisees types of those who do not follow	17	3
		"The power of the Lord was with him to heal"	17	4
27–32	6, II.	Feast at Levi's house.		
		Levi the publican—the type of the Gentiles—follows Jesus . .	27, 28	3
33–35	6, IV.	Fasting of John's disciples and feasting of those of Jesus.		
36–39	9*a*, III.	Parables of the Garments and Skins—didactic intrusion, which has an intimate relation with series 5 and 6.		
VI. 1–5	6, III.	Eating in the cornfields.		
6–11	6, I.	Healing the man with the withered hand.		
		Teaching	6	2
		The hint at Jesus' Death and Resurrection; compare the chronological parallel Mark iii. 6 . .	11	8
		Third Narrative Parallel.		
12–16	3, II.	Choosing the Twelve.		
		Mountain to pray	12	1
		"Judas, which was the traitor" .	16	4
		The level place: the multitude from all parts healed. They sought to touch Jesus, like the woman with the issue of blood of series 7, who was one of the types of Gentile faith . .	17–19	7
20–49	..	The Sermon on the Plain—a didactic intrusion into the Symbolical Portion, inserted between two items of series 7, and probably belonging to N.P. 9.		
20–26	11, I.	The Beatitudes.		
27–38	11, V.	Loving enemies.		
39–40	13, I.	Blind guides: disciple and Master.		
		Mote and beam—misplaced or corrupt passage	41, 42	..
43–45	13, I.	Tree and its fruit.		
46–49	16, II.	The houses on the rock and the earth.		
VII. 1–10	7, I.	Healing the centurion's servant.		
11–17	8, II.	Healing the widow's son at Nain.		

TABLE D—NARRATIVE PARALLELS OF LUKE'S GOSPEL

A.	B.	Subject.	C.	D.
		Fourth Narrative Parallel.		
VII. 18–21	1, II.	John's question.		
22–23	2, II.	The new gospel.		
24–35	5, III.	Teaching about the place of Judaism.		
36–39, 44–47	6, V.	Feast at Simon's house.		
40–43	9*a*, II.	Parable of the Two Debtors; see N.P. 2 for similar break in the ordered sequence.		
48–50	7, II.	Substitute for healing Syrophœnician's daughter.		
VIII. 1–18	14, I.	The Sower parable, when considered as a value of the Didactic Portion, appears as an insertion between two N.Ps.		
		Fifth Narrative Parallel.		
1–18	2, III.	The parable of the Sower symbolically considered, having a series 2 value in this earlier portion of Luke.		
		Preaching the good tidings of the Kingdom	1	2
		The women minister unto Him .	2, 3	3
19–21	3, III.	"My mother and My brethren are these which hear the word of God and do it."		
22–25	4, IV.	Stilling the tempest.		
26–30, 38, 39	4, V.	The miracle at Gadara or Gerasenes.		
31–37	5, V	The Swine.		
43–48	7, III.	Healing the woman with the issue of blood.		
40–42, 49–56	8, III.	Healing Jairus' daughter.		
		Forming doublet with x. 1–11, 17. This member is not original, and is a didactic intrusion into the Symbolical Portion which comes between two N.Ps. For the original member of the doublet, see N.P. 10	IX. 1–6, 10	
		Sixth Narrative Parallel.		
IX. 7–9	1, III.	Herod's question.		
		He spake of the kingdom of God to the multitude which followed, and He healed . . .	11	2, 3, 4
12–17	2, VI.	Feeding the five thousand.		

TABLE D—NARRATIVE PARALLELS OF LUKE'S GOSPEL

A.	B.	Subject.	C.	D.
		Seventh Narrative Parallel.		
IX. 18–20	1, IV.	The opinion of the multitude and the confession of Peter.		
21, 22	8, I.	The Son of Man to be rejected and raised up the third day.		
		Didactic intrusion composed of secondary members of doublets and sayings which are not original	23–27	..
		Eighth Narrative Parallel.		
28–36	1, V.	Transfiguration, "This is My Son, My chosen."		
		Mountain to pray . . .	28	1
37–43*a*	7, IV.	Healing the son of the man from the multitude.		
		Didactic Portion.		
		Ninth Narrative Parallel.		
43*b*–45	10, I.	The Son of Man shall be delivered up.		
46–48	10, II.	The little child the type of the true follower.		
		Original place of the Sermon on the Plain, covering the eleventh to the sixteenth series; for details, see the third N.P.		
		Tenth Narrative Parallel.		
49–50	3, IV.	The man casting out devils.	Symbolical intrusions, counterparts of series 10.	
51–56	3, V.	The Samaritans not rebuked.		
57–62	3, VI.	Following triple illustration.		
X. 1–9	11, II.	The Seventy start on their journey.		
		The harvest and the labourers .	1, 2	2, 3
		Lambs in the midst of wolves .	3	4
		Anti-Jewish corruption derived from Matthew	10–16	..
17–20	13, II.	Fall of Satan.		
21–24	14, II.	The things delivered of the Father.		

TABLE D—NARRATIVE PARALLELS OF LUKE'S GOSPEL

A.	B.	Subject.	C.	D.
		Eleventh Narrative Parallel.		
X. 25–28	9*b*, VII.	The lawyer.		
29–37	9*b*, V.	Parable of the Good Samaritan.		
38–42	9*a*, VI.	Mary and Martha.		
XI. 1–13	11, IV.	Teaching on prayer.		
		Casting out a dumb spirit . .	14, 15	
16, 29–32	12, I.	Sign of Jonah.		
14–26	13, III.	House of Satan.		
27, 28	14, III.	"Blessed are they that hear."		
33–36	14, I.	The lamp of thy body.		
		Anti-Jewish corruption derived from Matthew	37–52	
		Editorial insertion	53, 54	
XII. 1–3	14, IV.	The hidden revealed.		
4–12	15, IV.	The unforgivable sin (vers. 11 and 12 are the secondary member of doublet with XXI. 12–14).		
		Twelfth Narrative Parallel.		
13–21	9*b*, IV.	Parable of the Rich Fool.		
22–34	11, III.	Be not anxious for your life.		
35–40	16, II.	Blessed are those servants watching.		
		The lamp	35	14
41–48, 49–53	16, VI.	Explanations of parables subsequently given: with additions and corruptions of later date.		
		Thirteenth Narrative Parallel.		
54–56	12, II.	Signs of the weather.		
57–59	13, IV.	The adversary.		
XIII. 1–9	12, III.	Sign of the fig-tree.		
		Healing the woman bound by Satan — corrupt symbolical intrusion; for correct place see VI. 6–11	10–17	6, I.
18–19	14, III.	Parable of the Mustard Seed.		
20, 21	14, IV.	Parable of the Leaven.		
22–30	16, V.	Judgment and the need for watching.		
31–35	8, IV.	"The third day I am perfected."		
		Parallel with Matt. xxiii. 37–39, and of doubtful originality, but containing the idea of judgment and series 16	34, 35	16

TABLE D—NARRATIVE PARALLELS OF LUKE'S GOSPEL

A.	B.	Subject.	C.	D.
		Misplaced passages inserted between two Narrative Parallels: probably the wreck of the *Fourteenth Narrative Parallel.*		
		Healing the man with dropsy—symbolical intrusion; for correct place see vi. 6–11 . . .	XIV. 1–6	6, I.
XIV. 7–14	9*b*, I.	Parable of the Lowly Seat.		
15–24	16, IV.	The Great Supper.		
25–35	15, I.	The confession of Christ: Parables of the Tower and of the Warring King.		
XV. 1–7	9*a*, I.	The Hundred Sheep.		
8–10	9*a*, I.	The Lost Piece.		
11–32	9*a*, IV.	The Prodigal Son.		
XVI. 1–13	16, III.	The Unrighteous Steward.		
14–18	5, IV.	Symbolical intrusion, showing evidence of corruption.		
19–31	9*a*, VII.	Dives and Lazarus.		
		Fifteenth Narrative Parallel.		
		Anti-Jewish corruption derived from Matthew	XVII. 1–4	
XVII. 5–10	11, IV.	Illustration of the mustard seed.		
11–19	7, V.	Healing the Samaritan leper—symbolical intrusion.		
20–21	11, VI.	The kingdom within.		
22–25	12, V.	Signs.		
26–37	16, I	Illustration of Noah and others.		
		Sixteenth Narrative Parallel.		
XVIII. 1–8	9*a*, V.	The Importunate Widow.		
9–14	5, II.	Pharisee and Publican, called a parable, but really a symbolical intrusion.		
15–17	10, III.	Blessing little children.		
18–30	9*b*, III.	The rich ruler.		
31–34	14, V.	Prediction of death.		
35–43	14, V.	The eyes opened.		
XIX. 1–10	9*b*, VI.	The story of Zaccheus.		
11–27	16, VI.	Parable of the Ten Pounds.		

TABLE D—NARRATIVE PARALLELS OF LUKE'S GOSPEL

A.	B.	Subject.	C.	D.
		SYMBOLICAL AND DIDACTIC PORTIONS		
		Seventeenth Narrative Parallel.		
XIX. 28–38	2, IV.	The entry into Jerusalem		
		The Mount	XIX. 29	1
39, 40	10, V.	The Pharisees ask Jesus to rebuke the disciples		
		Superimposed teaching . .	41–44	..
45, 46	13, V.	Cleansing the Temple.		
47, 48	..	Doublet, with xx. 19 below.		
		The Baptism of John } misplaced	XX. 1–8	5, VI.
		The Wicked Husbandmen. } illustrations	9–18	16, VII.
XX. 19	..	Doublet with xix. 47, 48, hinting at the insertion of xx. 1–18.		
20–26	15, II.	Tribute to Cæsar.		
27–40	5, VII.	The Sadducees and the Resurrection; incorrectly placed in the order of series 8, the idea of which is Resurrection.		
		Eighteenth Narrative Parallel.		
41–44	1, VI.	Christ is not David's son.		
		Anti-Jewish corruption from Matt.	XX. 45-47	..
XXI. 1–4	9*b*, II.	The widow's mite.		
		Superimposed teaching and corrupt sayings	5–7*a*, 9, 10, 16, 17, 20–24	
7*b*, 8	12, V.	Signs.		
11, 25–28	12, VI.	Signs.		
29–33	12, IV.	Signs.		
12, 19	15, III.	Bearing the cross after Jesus.		
34–36	16, I.	The impending Judgment.		
		Nineteenth Narrative Parallel.		
		Teaching: the people come to hear	XXI. 37,38	2, 3
		Chief priests seek to put Jesus to death	XXII. 1, 2	4
XXII. 3–6	4, VI.	Satan enters into Judas.		
7–13	6, VI.	Preparation for the Passover.		
14–23	10, VII.	The Last Supper: the cup of service.		
24–27	10, IV.	"I am in the midst of you as he that serveth."		
28–30	11, VII.	"Ye shall sit on thrones."		
31–38	13, VII.	Satan asked to have Peter.		

TABLE D—NARRATIVE PARALLELS OF LUKE'S GOSPEL

A.	B.	Subject.	C.	D.
		Twentieth Narrative Parallel.		
		He went unto the Mount and prayed. His disciples followed and He taught them	39–40	1, 2, 3
XXII. 41–45	10, VI.	"Father, . . . remove this cup from Me."		
		Rise and pray	46	11
47, 48	13, VI.	Betrayal by Judas.		
49–53	14, VI.	The healing of the ear: "This is your hour and the power of darkness."		
54–62	15, V.	The denial by Peter.		
63–69	8, V.	The Son of Man at the right hand of the power of God.		
		Twenty-first Narrative Parallel.		
70, 71	1, VII.	"Art Thou the Son of God?"		
XXIII 1–12	2, VII.	The achievement of the mission.		
13–25	4, VII.	"Crucify Him!"		
26	7, VI.	Simon the Cyrenean bears the cross.		
27–31	12, VII.	The green tree and the dry.		
32, 39–43	15, VI.	Jesus and the malefactors: the promise of Paradise.		
33–38, 44–46	8, VI.	Jesus gives up the ghost.		
		Twenty-second Narrative Parallel.		
47–49	3, VII.	The confession of the centurion.		
50–56	6, VII.	They returned and prepared spices and ointment.		
XXIV. 1–12	7, VII.	The faith of Mary Magdalene.		
13–45	14, VII.	The mystery explained and understood.		
46–49	15, VII.	"Ye are witnesses of these things."		
50–53	8, VII.	The Ascension.		

INDEX OF SERIES AND STAGE: THE GOSPEI

	Stage I.	Stage II.	Stage III
			Sy
Prologue .	..	IV. 1–13	..
Series 1 .	III. 21, 22	VII. 18–21	IX. 7–9
,, 2 .	IV. 14–22*a*	VII. 22–23	VIII. 1–8
,, 3 .	V. 1–11	VI. 12–16	VIII. 19–21
,, 4 .	IV. 31–37	IV. 38, 39	V. 12–15
,, 5 .	V. 16–26	XVIII. 9–14	VII. 24–35
,, 6 .	VI. 6–11	V. 27–32	VI. 1–5
	XIII. 10–17	..	..
	XIV. 1–6	..	..
,, 7 .	VII. 1–10	VII. 48–50	VIII. 43–48
,, 8 .	IX. 21, 22	VII. 11–17	VIII. 40–42,
,, 9*a*.	XV. 1–10	VII. 40–43	V. 36–39
,, 9*b*.	XIV. 7–14	XXI. 1–4	XVIII. 18–30
,, 10 .	IX. 43*b*–45	IX. 46–48	XVIII. 15–17
,, 11 .	VI. 17–26	X. 1–9 (IX. 1–6)	XII. 22–34
,, 12 .	XI. 16, 29–32	XII. 54–56	XIII. 6–9
	..	..	..
,, 13 .	VI. 39–45	X. 17–20	XI. 14–26
,, 14 .	VIII. 9–18	X. 21–24	XIII. 18, 19
	XI. 33–36	..	XI. 27, 28
,, 15 .	XIV. 25–35 (IX. 23–27)	XX. 20–26	XXI. 12–19
,, 16 .	XVII. 26–37	VI. 46–49	XVI. 1–13
	XXI. 34–36	XII. 35–40	..

DIX E

LUKE REARRANGED IN THE PRE-SYNOPTIC ORDER

Stage IV.	Stage V.	Stage VI.	Stage VII.
AL PORTION.			
..	..	..	..
IX. 18–20	IX. 28–36	XX. 41–44	XXII. 70–71
XIX. 28–38	IV. 22*b*–30	IX. 10–17	XXIII. 1–12
IX. 49, 50	IX. 51–56	IX. 57–62	XXIII. 47–49
VIII. 22–25	VIII. 26–30, 37*b*, 39	XXII. 3–6	XXIII. 13–25
XVI. 14–18	VIII. 31–37*a*	XX. 1–8	XX. 27–40
V. 33–35	VII. 36–39, 44–47	XXII. 7–13	XXIII. 50–56
..	..	..	..
..	..	..	..
IX. 37–43*a*	XVII. 11–19	XXIII. 26	XXIV. 1–12
XIII. 31–35	XXII. 63–69	XXIII. 33–38, 44–46	XXIV. 50–53
O PORTION.			
XV. 11–32	XVIII. 1–8	X. 38–42	XVI. 19–31
XII. 13–21	X. 29–37	XIX. 1–10	X. 25–28
XXII. 24–27	XIX. 39, 40	XXII. 39–46	XXII. 14–23
XI. 1–13 ; XVII. 5–10	VI. 27–38	XVII. 20, 21	XXII. 28–30
XXI. 29–33 ·	XVII. 22–25	XXI. 11, 25–28	XXIII. 27–31
..	XXI. 7*b*, 8	..	..
XII. 57–59	XIX. 45–48	XXII. 47, 48	XXII. 31–38
XIII. 20, 21	XVIII. 31–43	XXII. 49–53	XXIV. 13–45
XII. 1–3	..	..	..
XII. 4–12	XXII. 54–62	XXIII. 32, 33*b*, 39–43	XXIV. 46–49
XIV. 15–24	XIII. 22–30	XIX. 11–27	XX. 9–19
..	..	XII. 41–48	..

PRINTED BY
MORRISON AND GIBB LTD., EDINBURGH AND LONDON

DATE DUE

AUG 0 7 2000

HIGHSMITH #45230

Printed in USA

121073 2265 C88
AUTHOR Crompton, R. H.
TITLE Synoptic Problem and a new
2265 C88
121073

GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
00122019